This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

From the Ewald Flügel Library

LELAND·STANFORD·JVNIOR·VNIVERSITY

From the Ewald Flügel Library

LELAND·STANFORD·JVNIOR·VNIVERSITY

B 471d

Half title wanting.

The works of
Richard Brome

v 2

K.

DISSERTATIONS UPON
THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS,

THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES,

AND UPON

THE FABLES OF ÆSOP:

ALSO,

EPISTOLA AD JOANNEM MILLIUM.

BY RICHARD BENTLEY, D.D.

EDITED, WITH NOTES,

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER DYCE.

LONDON:
FRANCIS MACPHERSON,
MIDDLE ROW, HOLBORN.
1836.

216610

STANFORD LIBRARY

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.

XIII.

But, since tyrants will not be confined by laws, let us suppose, if you will, that our Phalaris might make use of the Attic, for no reason at all but his own arbitrary humour and pleasure; yet we have still another indictment against the credit of the *Epistles*. For even the Attic of the true Phalaris's age is not there represented, but a more recent idiom and style, that by the whole thread and colour of it betrays itself to be many centuries younger than he. Every living language, like the perspiring bodies of living creatures, is in perpetual motion and alteration; some words go off, and become obsolete; others are taken in, and by degrees grow into common use; or the same word is inverted to a new sense and notion, which in tract of time makes as observable a change in the air and features of a language, as age makes in the lines and mien of a face. All are sensible of this in their own native tongues, where continual use

makes every man a critic. For what Englishman does not think himself able, from the very turn and fashion of the style, to distinguish a fresh English composition from another a hundred years old? Now, there are as real and sensible differences in the several ages of Greek, were there as many that could discern them. But very few are so versed and practised in that language, as ever to arrive at that subtilty of taste. And yet as few will be content to relish or dislike a thing, not by their own sense, but by another man's palate. So that should I affirm that I know the novity of these *Epistles* from the whole body and form of the work, none, perhaps, would be convinced by it, but those that, without my indication, could discover it by themselves. I shall let that alone then, and point only at a few particular marks and moles in the *Letters*, which every one that pleases may know them by. In the very first Epistle, ὧν ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις, *which you accuse me of*, is an innovation in language; for which the ancients used προφέρεις. In the CXLII., among other presents to a bride he sends θυγατέρας τέτταρας ὁμήλικας, which would anciently have signified *daughters;* but he here means it of *virgins* or *maidens;* as *fille* and *figlia* signify in French and Italian; which is a most manifest token of a later Greek. Even Tzetzes,* when he tells the story out of this Epistle, interprets it *maids*, θεραπαίνας. In the LXXVII. πολλοὶ παίδων ὄντες ἐρασταὶ, *many that are fond of their children*, for that is his sense of the words; which of old would have been taken for *a flagitious love of boys;* as if he had said

* Chiliad. p. 196. [=V. 915. p. 192. *ed. Kiess.*—D.]

πολλοὶ ὄντες παιδεραστοί. They that will make the search may find more of this sort; but I suppose these are sufficient to unmask the recent Sophist under the person of the old Tyrant.

What the Examiner has been pleased to animadvert upon this article is comprehended under two heads; his general reflection upon the purity and stability of the Greek tongue, and his particular exceptions to the words that I had marked out as tokens of a recent writer.

In his general harangue he first spends a whole page to inform us of a great piece of news, that our English tongue has undergone very considerable changes (p. 69.): then he asks me these pertinent questions, *Do you take the Greek of Lucian to be as different from that of Plato, as our English now is from that which was spoken soon after the Conquest? are not Homer and Oppian much nearer one another in their language than Chaucer and Cowley, though in time they are far more distant?* (p. 70.) As if I had supposed that the gradual alteration of the Greek language was as great in every century while it lasted, as that of our English tongue this last hundred years: whereas it's as plain as words can make it, that I compared the changes of the Greek during the whole interval between the true Phalaris and the Sophist, which I called in a round number *a thousand years*, with the changes of our English *in the last hundred.* Then he commences a formal and sophistical declamation about the *reasons that made the Greek language so fixed and unalterable* (p. 70.); where he gives us some shining metaphors, and a polished period or two; but for the matter of it, it is either some common and obvious thought dressed and curled in the beauish way, or some new mistake, which now at last has its happy birth from the fertile genius of our Examiner. The reader shall judge between us, whether I pay him in his own coin, that is, misrepresent him, when he has considered what I shall now say.

The accusation that I brought against the *Epistles* was this; *that the author has writ them in the new and recent Attic, not that which was in use in the age of the true Phalaris,* whom the Examiner himself owns to have been contemporary with Solon. So that, if we can make any discovery what the Attic language was in Solon's time, we may be sure that the true Phalaris would have spoken in the same way, had he a mind to have used that dialect. There's an oration ascribed to Lysias, *against Theomnestus,*[b] which Harpocration once or twice questions if it be genuine: but whether it be Lysias's or not, it's all one to our present purpose; for we know the time that it was made, and by that account it may well enough be Lysias's. That orator died at Olymp. c. 2. or c. 3.,[c] and this oration appears to be made three or four years before, at Olymp. XCIX. 4. For the person who speaks it tells us, *Ἐμοὶ μὲν ἔτη εἰσὶ τριάκοντα·** *ἐξ ὅτου ὑμεῖς κατεληλύθατε, εἰκοστὸν τουτί· φαίνομαι οὖν τρισκαιδεκέτης ὤν, ὅτε ὁ πατὴρ ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀπέθνησκε*; *I am now,* says he, XXX. *years old, and this is the* XX*th year since you Athenians returned hither: so that I was* XIII. *years of age when my father was killed by the thirty tyrants.*[d] This is the common reading of that passage; but if we examine it, it will be found to be a manifest depravation. For the thirty tyrants began Olymp. XCIV. 1.,[e] and, in fear of them, half of the Athenians forsook their country: then, at Olymp. XCIV. 4. the thirty were deposed, and those that had left Athens (*κατεληλύθασι*) *returned* again. If the person, then, that spoke this oration was XXX. years old in the XXth year after the return of the Athenians, he could not possibly be XIII. years old, nor above X., when the thirty tyrants murdered his father. But the true correction of this place may be had from the next oration, which is called *The Second*

[b] Lysias *κατὰ Θεομνήστου.*

[c] Dionys. Halic. in Lysiâ.

[* *Ἐμοὶ γάρ . . . . ἔτη εἰσὶ τριάκοντα τρία. Or. At.* I. 281. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[d] Lys. p. 116.

[e] Diod. and others. [Bentley was misled here by Diodorus: see Clinton's *Fasti Hellen. from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.* p. 84. *sec. ed.*—D.]

against Theomnestus,[f] but is really nothing else but the rough draught of the other; where the person's age is thus set forth; *Ἔτη . . ἔστι μοι δύο καὶ τριάκοντα· ἐξ οὗ δ' ὑμεῖς κατήλθετε, εἰκοστὸν τουτί· φαίνομαι οὖν δωδεκαέτης ὢν, ὅτε ὁ πατὴρ ὑπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἀπέθνησκεν*; *I am now,* says he, XXXII. *years of age; and this is the* XX*th year since your return; so that I was* XII. *years old when my father was killed by the thirty.* Now, this account is agreeable to history and truth; for if the XXXII. year of this person's age was coincident with the XXth after the return of the Athenians, then his XIIth falls upon the last year of the thirty tyrants, and in that we must suppose his father was killed. So that, in the other oration, for *ἔτη λ'* we must read *ἔτη λβ'*, and *ιβέτης* for *ιγέτης*; for the numbers, being thus written in numeral letters, were very liable to be mistaken. Upon the whole, therefore, as I said before, this oration must have been written at Olymp. XCIX. 4., which is CCXIII. years after the archonship of Solon, when he made his body of laws. Now, by the laws of Athens, if a man called another *ἀνδροφόνον, a murderer,* it was penal: so that the person who speaks this oration brings an action against Theomnestus for saying *he had killed his father, τὸν πατέρα ἀπεκτονέναι.* The defendant makes his exception to the indictment, because he did not call him *ἀνδροφόνον,* which was the word that was penal by law. But the other replies, that the sense and meaning of the laws was to be regarded, as well as the words: *For though things,* says he, *continue the same, yet we do not use some of the same words that our ancestors did.*[g] *Let the crier read some of the old laws of Solon.* *ΔΕΔΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΗΙ ΠΟΔΟΚΑΚΗΙ. Here what was ποδοκάκη,* the stocks, *in Solon's time, is now called τὸ ξύλον.* *ΕΠΕΙΤΥΑΙΝ ΕΠΙΟΡΚΗΣΑΝΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΑΠΟΛΑΩ· ΔΕΔΙΟΤΑ ΔΕ ΔΙΚΗΣ ΕΝΕΚΑ ΔΡΑΣΚΑΖΕΙΝ. Here is ἐπιορκεῖν,* to swear, *which we now call ὀμόσαι; and δρασκάζειν,* to run away, *which is now ἀποδιδράσκειν.* *ΟΣΤΙΣ*

[f] Lys. p. 119. [g] Lysias, p. 118.

ΑΠΙΛΛΗΙ ΤΗΙ ΘΥΡΑΙ. Here's ἀπίλλειν, to exclude, *for which we now say ἀποκλείειν. ΤΟ ΑΡΓΥΡΙΟΝ ΣΤΑΣΙΜΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ. Here στάσιμον does not signify* to weigh money in scales, *as we now use the word, but* to let it out at use. *ΟΣΑΙ ΠΕΦΑΣΜΕΝΩΣ ΠΩΛΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΙΚΗΟΣ. Here πεφασμένως signifies* openly, *which we now call φανερῶς; and πωλεῖσθαι is* to walk, *now βαδίζειν; and οἰκῆος is* a servant, *now θεράποντος: and there are many more such as these.*[h] The ingenious reader may please to observe the last words of Lysias, *that there are many more such as these;*[i] and then he will have a just apprehension of the great change of the Attic tongue between Solon and Lysias's time. Some of those words of Solon that our orator has produced here are mentioned too by others: as *ποδοκάκη* is quoted from Solon by Demosthenes;[j] and *πεφασμένως πωλοῦνται* by Plutarch,[k] which he interprets, as Lysias does, *ἐμφανῶς φοιτῶσιν.* And if a proportionable number of such antiquated words do not occur in the other fragments of Solon's laws, the reason is because the writers do not cite the very words, but only express the sense of them. As when Plutarch relates the law, *that whoever βιάσηται, ravished, a free-woman should pay a hundred drachms,*[l] we know from Hesychius that the original word of Solon was not *βιάσασθαι,* but *βινεῖν.*[m] But, in another place, where he declares that he cites the law *αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι,*[n] *word for word, ΕΠΙ ΦΟΝΩΙ Η ΣΦΑΓΑΙΣΙΝ,* we do not fail to meet with the old obsolete idiom, as *σφαγαῖσιν* here for *σφαγαῖς.*

Now, I suppose it's sufficiently plain from these specimens, that the Attic dialect was not so very stable and immutable as the Examiner imagines. There were only two centuries betwixt Solon and Lysias; and the alteration seems to be almost as great as what has happened in our

[h] P. 117.
[i] Πολλὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἄλλα ἐστίν.
[j] Demost. c. Timoc.
[k] Plut. Solon.
[l] Plut. Sol.
[m] Hesych. in Βεινεῖν.
[n] Plut. Sol.

own language within the same space. For as to the changes of entire words, the instances here alleged are a plain proof of it; and for the orthography, or way of spelling, which is the principal variation of the modern English from the old, we should find as considerable a difference between Solon's and Lysias's spelling, if we had a sight of the original *Κύρβεις*, tables of his laws. For in Solon's time there were but XVIII. Greek letters in all, the rest being invented afterwards by Epicharmus and Simonides;[o] and we are sure that the whole XXIV. were not in public use at Athens till the archonship of Euclides, Olymp. XCIV. 2.[p] So that some of the words cited above by Lysias and Plutarch were by Solon spelled thus; *ΔΕΔΕΣΤΗΑΙ· ΤΕΙ ΤΗΤΡΑΙ· ΠΗΟΝΟΙ Ε ΣΠΗΑΓΑΙΣΙΝ.* Upon all accounts, therefore, the Attic was no more privileged from change than the other languages of the world are. Nay, we may suppose there was a greater change in it betwixt Theseus and Solon than between Solon and Lysias, the former interval being three times as long as the latter. For we know that the Attic and Ionic were originally the very same language,[q] and yet afterwards we find them to differ exceedingly. I make no question but the Ionians, who were Attic colonies, had a gradual change in their dialect, as well as Athens, their common mother, had. For Herodotus informs us, *that the Ionians had four quite different idioms of language;*[r] so that it's evident that they too had varied from the ancient Attic. But yet it's pretty observable that several of those antiquated words of Solon's are what we now call Ionic: as, *πωλοῦμαι* for *βαδίζω* is very frequent in Homer;

*Οὔτε ποτ' εἰς ἀγορὴν πωλέσκετο κυδιάνειραν.**

And so *οἰκῆος* for *θεράποντος* is doubly Ionic, both as to the

[o] See here, vol. i. p. 291, 292.
[p] See Meursius, Fort. Attic. p. 63. Vales. Harpocrat. p. 101.
[q] See here, vol. i. p. 358.
[r] Herod. i. 142. *Χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης τέσσαρες.*
[* *Il.* I. 490.—D.]

whole word and as to the termination of it, ῆος for έως: and this too is several times in Homer;

Ἐξ ὕπνου γοόωσα φίλους οἰκῆας ἐγείροι.*

And this illustrates, and is itself illustrated by, Dionysius Halicarn., who asserts clearly, and fully to our purpose, *that the ancient Attic dialect had but some small variations*[s] *from the Ionic.* Now, to apply this to the *Epistles* of Phalaris, I would crave leave to ask the admirers of them, if the Attic dialect there be after Solon's example, as it would certainly be if the Tyrant had writ them? Is the formation of nouns after Solon's model, αισι for αις, and ηος for εως? Are there any antiquated words there, as πωλεῖσθαι, δρασκάζειν, πεφασμένως, &c.? And yet the sense of some of them occurs there, but expressed in a more recent way. Though, if we consider what Lysias says, *that there were* πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, MANY *such in Solon's laws,* it must be owned that the true *Epistles* of Phalaris had been full of such words as perhaps would have puzzled a better scholar (if there can be one) than the late Editor of the false ones.

The Examiner seems to take pains to persuade us that the Attic dialect was of such a fixed and durable nature, that it's in vain to pretend to distinguish any different ages of it. But the Greeks themselves were of another opinion, if they may be allowed in their own language to be as knowing as Mr. B. Some of them were so nice as to distinguish a middle age of that dialect between the times of Solon and Lysias. Dionysius Halicarn. tells us, *that Lysias was the best pattern of the Attic tongue, not of that ancient one that Plato and Thucydides used, but of the fashionable one in his own time.*[t] So that *here* are three sorts of Attic specified within the compass of two centuries; for I suppose it's plain that Thucydides's language is as different from that of Solon's laws as from that of Lysias's orations. Demetrius

[* *Il.* V. 413., where ἐγείρῃ.—D.]

[s] Dionys. de Thucyd. p. 147. Μικράς τινας . . . διαφοράς.

[t] Dionys. v. Lys. [*De Lysiâ Judicium.*—D.]

Magnes, in the passage above cited, calls a pretended letter of Epimenides to Solon an imposture, *because it was written in the Attic tongue, and even in the new Attic.*[u] Do but substitute the name of Phalaris instead of Epimenides, and 'tis exactly the same indictment that I have made to the *Epistles*. All the three, Epimenides, Solon, and Phalaris, were contemporaries; and if Epimenides's letter was detected to be a cheat, because it was the new Attic, by the same rule we must discard Phalaris's; for Demetrius could know of no newer Attic than that of Phalaris's *Epistles*. Nay, there's nothing more common in the Greek writers than this distinction of the old and new Attic;[v] as may be seen in *Etymologicon M.*, Eustathius, *Prolegom. ad Aristoph.*, Synesius *De Insomniis*, &c. *The Attic language*, says Lucian, *has in tract of time undergone many changes; but the word ἀποφρὰς has had the luck to continue all along.*[w] So far was he from believing it so *fixed and enduring*, as the Examiner dreams it was.

The causes of the changes in the Attic language are not so secret and abstruse, but that a man of less sagacity than Mr. B. might easily have found them out. For, if we consider the great conflux of strangers to that city; the vast numbers of slaves from all nations, and of foreigners that settled there; the frequent wars that they had abroad, and the hired troops that they often maintained at home; and their mighty trade both in their own port and all over Greece; we shall rather admire, that the alterations in their dialect were so few, than affirm with Mr. B. that there were none at all. In Demetrius Phalereus's time, at Olymp. cx., the inhabitants of Attica were 21,000 citizens, 10,000 foreigners naturalised, and 400,000 slaves.[x] Now, if there were above xix. slaves and strangers to one citizen, as by

[u] Laër. in Epim. Γεγραμμένην Ἀτθίδι (φωνῇ), καὶ ταύτῃ νέᾳ.

[v] Ἀρχαία καὶ νέα Ἀτθίς.

[w] Lucian. de Apoph. Πολλὰ ἐκτρεψάντων.

[x] Athen. p. 272. [=II. 543. *ed Schw.*—D.]

this account it plainly appears, this cause alone is more than sufficient to introduce a great change in their dialect.

But the ingenious Mr. B. tells us, *that the empire of the Greeks did not a little contribute to the stability of their language* (p. 71.); that is, as he afterwards expresses it, *to the keeping it entire and unmixed.* Now, I am of opinion, that if another man had been to name some of the causes of the *change and mixture* of the Greek, or indeed of any other tongue, he would have pitched upon *empire* in the first place. For even common sense will tell one, that if a nation extends its conquests over other countries of a different speech, and retain[s] them in subjection by standing armies and garrisons, and by keeping all the civil power and public offices in its own hands, it may extinguish indeed, by this means, the ancient language of the conquered, but its own too must needs have a little mixture, and imbibe something from the tongue that it destroys: as, by pouring a great quantity of water to a little wine,

*Ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον, ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ,**

you may quite destroy the wine, but yet the water will taste of the mixture. It is evident, from the laws of Numa, and the XII. Tables, and the Inscription on the *Columna Duiliana,* compared with the plays of Terence, that the Roman language had a greater change in the last C. years between Duilius and Terence than in the CCCC. between Numa and Duilius. And the true reason of this was *empire;* for before Duilius's time, in the first Punic war, the Romans had got nothing beyond Italy; but in the following century they carried their eagles almost all over Europe. So that the vast confluence of people from all the provinces, the introducing of foreign artificers and captive slaves from every quarter, and the natives that returned home from the expeditions, made an innovation of language at Rome itself.

[* From the *Cyclops* of Aristias: see Suidas in *Ἀπώλεσας*, and Schw. *Animadv. in Athen.* iv. 666.—D.]

And if Alexander's conquests in Asia had not altogether as great an effect upon the Greek tongue, the reason was because the empire was soon divided into so many branches. But if Alexander had returned out of Asia, and placed the seat of his empire in some city of Greece, and transmitted it entire to posterity, the vast crowds of those that would have come to court from the furthest parts of the monarchy would have made the same alteration of the language there as afterwards happened at Rome.

But Mr. B. is in great admiration at the stability of the Greek tongue: *it was incomparably*, he says, *the most fixed and enduring of any that we are generally acquainted with* (p. 70). What languages *we*, that is, the Examiner and his Assistant, *are acquainted with*, I know not; and therefore I have nothing to say against this proposition. But when he goes on, and tells us, *that no other language that has been of known and familiar use in the world* (p. 71.) has been as durable as the Greek, and that it was absolutely *the most holding tongue in the world* (p. 72.), the Examiner had better have *holden his tongue* than have talked so crudely and erroneously. For we are sure, from the names of persons and places mentioned in Scripture before the deluge, not to insist upon other arguments, that the Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind; and it continued pure for above 3000 years, till the captivity into Babylon. Even from the date of the Mosaic law to the prophecy of Ezekiel there's a distance of 900 years; yet the language of the two writers is the very same. What can the Examiner shew like this, either for continuance or purity, in the Greek tongue? I will mention one language more, and that is the Syriac. The Holy Scripture informs us, that Laban the Syrian, when he made a league with his son-in-law Jacob, called the heap of stones, that, after the custom of those times, was erected for a memorial of it, יגר שהדותא *Igar Sahdutha*,[y]

[y] Genes. xxxi. 47.

the heap of witness; which we are sure, from the Syriac versions of the *Old* and *New Testament,* continued to be pure and vulgar Syriac for 2000 years; nay, the very same language is said to be preserved and spoken to this day by the Maronites of Mount Libanus in Syria; so that the Syriac has lasted for above 3400 years, with little or no variation.

The Examiner makes a mighty flourish about the *sweetness, and smoothness, and the music of the Greek tongue* (p. 70.); and assigns that as the reason of its lasting so long. But, at that rate, he must make another speech about the *sweetness and smoothness* of the Eastern tongues, since they lasted much longer. But the true reason of that long continuance both of Hebrew and Syriac was because the nations continued unmixed and separate from strangers; and the preservation of the Greek language, though not in the same degree of purity and duration with the two other, is wholly owing to the same cause. For, till the time of Alexander, the wars and the business of the Greeks were for the most part among one another, and not with foreign nations. So that, though the particular dialects were perpetually changed and diversified by their mutual conquests and commerce, yet the same language for the main continued still. But when the Roman government was established among them, immediately the Latin names of offices, and terms of law, &c. overrun the old Greek language; so that we have Dictionaries of barbarous words of Greece, almost as voluminous as those of the true ones.

Mr. B. avers, *that we have Greek books, writ by authors at almost* 2000 *years' distance, which disagree less in phrase and manner of speech than any two English ones at* 200 *years' distance* (p. 71). But Mr. B. is not aware, that the reason of this was not, because the same phrases and manner of speech continued all that while in civil and popular use, but purely because the later writers would *imitate* the old ones, as the moderns now imitate Cicero and Virgil. This is evident from the innumerable Greek Lexicons and Scho-

liasts, some yet preserved, but most of them lost, the design of which was to explain the obsolete words in the old writers of verse and prose by such other Greek words as were then in use. For Homer and Archilochus, Thucydides and Herodotus, were not thoroughly understood by the vulgar Greeks in Oppian's time, but only by the learned. Nay, even Oppian himself, who took the allowed privilege of using antiquated words, (as, among us, Spenser and Milton did, though a little more sparingly,) could not be understood in his own town, except by the learned. And, to shew farther that it was imitation only, that makes the Greek books of different ages so alike, that general manner of speech called κοινὴ διάλεκτος, *the common dialect*, which the writers after Alexander's time commonly used, was never at any time, or in any place, the popular idiom, but perfectly a language of the learned, almost as the Latin is now. I say *almost*, because they did not tie themselves up so strictly to imitation, but that still their style had some leaven from the age that each of them lived in. 'Tis the felicity, therefore, of the Latin tongue, that it's no longer in popular use; and it's more fitted, upon that very account, to be the universal language of learning, because it's no longer liable to those changes to which living languages are naturally obnoxious, but, by being dead, it's become immortal. The Greek, indeed, would have done as well for that purpose; but there ought to be but one such language, and the Latin has already got the possession. As for our English tongue, the great alterations it has undergone in the two last centuries are principally owing to that vast stock of Latin words which we have transplanted into our own soil: which being now in a manner exhausted, one may easily presage that it will not have such changes in the two next centuries. Nay, it were no difficult contrivance, if the public had any regard to it, to make the English tongue immutable, unless hereafter some foreign nation shall invade and overrun us.

I have now examined Mr. B.'s general reflections upon the stability of the Greek tongue, which he has made so

sinistrously, and with so very little judgment, as if he aspired after the character of Homer's Margites,

*Ὃς μὲν ἐπίστατο πολλὰ, κακῶς δ' ἠπίστατο πάντα,**

who knew a great many things, but all of them wrong. But let us see what exceptions he has made to my particular instances of Phalaris's recent language.

I. The first that I had produced is out of the first Epistle, *προτρέπω, to accuse;* which Mr. B. perhaps believes he has answered in an harangue of four pages (p. 208, 209, 210, 211). But, if I may be allowed to speak freely, 'tis such miserable chicanery, 'tis so much below even himself (*I compliment him when I say so* (p. 54.), to return him his own civility,) that I cannot abuse my reader's patience in winnowing and sifting it, since the whole is nothing but chaff. He had translated *προτρέπω to exhort;* but I observed, that in this place neither sense nor syntax would allow of that signification. As for the *syntax,* he has not so much as offered any example, either Greek or Latin, where *προτρέπω,* in the sense of *exhortation,* admits a dative case after it, as it has here; yet, however, he still contends that the *sense* of the passage will admit that meaning of the word. And, to give him his just commendation, he has taken the right way to put an end to any dispute; for a man that talks at that rate resolves not to be confuted. If I say that grass is green, or snow's white, I am still at the courtesy of my antagonist; for if he should rub his forehead, and deny it, I do not see by what syllogism I could refute him. So, if the learned Examiner shall still insist upon't, that the *sense* of the place is *to exhort,* I have nothing further to urge, but must leave him either to be laughed at, or pitied, or admired, as his readers are disposed towards him.

I had observed, that the *Latin version of Phalaris, which*

[* From *Alcib.* ii. of Plato, *Op.* iii. 116. ed. 1826. Buttman would read, Πόλλ' *ἠπίστατο ἔργα, κακῶς, κ. τ. λ.*; and so the line is given among the *Frag. Hom.* ed. Ern.—D.]

is falsely ascribed to Cujacius (for both original and translation of this book have the luck to be fathered upon wrong authors), interprets *προτρέπω to accuse;* so that Mr. B. might have learned from thence the true meaning of this passage: but it so happened, *that that edition, though in the public library at Oxon, lay all the while concealed from our late Editor, that then lived there.* Upon this, Mr. B. commences a very heavy charge against me: *'tis a greater blemish to me,* he says, *than want of judgment; I'm a man of extraordinary confidence, that can so boldly assert, what it's impossible I should know; that would face him down, that he never saw what he knows himself to have often seen and used,* (that is, before he finished his Edition of Phalaris); and at last he avers, that *indeed the edition of Cujacius was one of those printed copies he meant in his Preface* (p. 212). Now, this is a very tender controversy, and I'm afraid the very softest handling of it will touch somebody to the quick. Honour and reputation are nice things, and if once they happen to receive a flaw, they are not easily repaired. I will not make myself an arbitrator here; but the reader shall judge between Mr. B. and me. The words of his Preface are these; *there are two versions of Phalaris that I had before me; the one by Naogeorgus, published in the year* 1557; *the other, as it seems, by a certain Jesuit, for the use of their schools, in the year* 1614. *The Jesuit is pretty elegant in his language, but he is too loose and diffuse; so that he always differs from the style of the author, and often from the sense. There's a third version too by Francis Aretine.*[z] Now, I must own, that at that time, when I first published my *Dissertation,* I had not seen this edition of the Jesuit that Mr. B. here speaks of; and I believed it had a translation peculiar to it. For I trusted to Mr. B.'s account, *that the Jesuit had made it,* and consequently that it could not be the same with Cujacius's. I concluded, therefore, he

[z] Versiones . . duæ, altera à . . Naogeorgo . . edita an. 1557; altera à quodam, ut videtur, Jesuitâ in usum Schol. Soc. Jes. 1614 . . . . Jesuita in dictione non inornatus est, sed laxus, &c.

had never seen Cujacius's version; because he expressly says he made use of three only, that of Naogeorgus, and the Jesuit's, and Aretine's. And where now was my *extraordinary confidence*, in saying he had not seen the edition of Cujacius? and how was it *impossible that I should know it?* I believed my inference to be true and logical; and I'll put it into the form of a syllogism, that Mr. B. may examine whether it agree with his System of Logic.

Mr. B. made use of three versions only; one made by Naogeorgus, another by a Jesuit, and a third by Aretine:

But Cujacius's version was neither made by Naogeorgus, nor by a Jesuit, nor by Aretine:

Therefore Mr. B. made no use of Cujacius's version.

If it be such *a blemish* to me, and such *extraordinary confidence*, to pretend, by virtue of this syllogism, that Cujacius's edition was then unknown to Mr. B., I shall have the worse opinion of all books of logic for 't, not excepting Mr. B.'s own system. I had a small suspicion too, besides, that the editor had not seen that edition in the public library, because it is not entered in the Catalogue under the title of *Phalaris*, but of *Epistolæ*, and *Cujacius*. So that a person that does not otherways know of that edition, cannot find it in that Catalogue, unless by a great chance, or by reading it all over. I believed likewise, *that Mr. B. had not seen the edition of Aldus;* because Aldus's text is sometimes better than that which Mr. B. has followed. I had that opinion then of his judgment, that I supposed he had not seen those things, because he did not give them the preference; as indeed it was a third argument to me that he had not seen Cujacius's, because he did not follow him in the true translation of the word *προτρέπω*. Thus I reasoned at that time; but I am now sensible that I argued weakly enough; for I have found by tedious experience, that he can stumble upon things without seeing them, and see and handle things without understanding them.

The reader has now a fair and ingenuous account, on my part: let us see if Mr. B.'s have the same characters of can-

dour and veracity. He affirms, with great warmth and vehemence, that he had (*præ manibus*) *before him and in his hands* both the edition of the Jesuit and that of Cujacius; and he adds too, *that the version ascribed to Cujacius is exactly the same with that put out by the Jesuit* (p. 212). Which is very true, for the Jesuit only reprinted it. Give me leave now, without calling Mr. B.'s honour in question, to argue a little for dispute's sake, that, notwithstanding this repeated asseveration, yet he had not Cujacius by him. Cujacius was printed at Geneva, in the year 1606. And the Jesuit's edition, that Mr. B. used, was printed at Ingolstadt, 1614. Now, Mr. B. tells the world in his Preface, *that the* JESUIT *made that version;* and *the* JESUIT, he says, *is elegant in his Latin, but differs from the style of the original.* But how could Mr. B. suppose that the Jesuit made it at Ingolstadt, 1614, if he then knew that *exactly the same version was printed* VIII. *years before at Geneva?* If he had both the books *before his hands,* he could not possibly make such a horrible blunder. Those that have a just esteem of his wit and sagacity will never believe, no not upon his own word, that he could be guilty of such wretched stupidity. There must needs be some other way, then, for solving this difficulty, though I confess it's too hard for me. I refer it, therefore, to the reader's consideration; and if he find it gravels him too, it may call a certain verse to his memory;

> *Accipe nunc Danaûm insidias, et crimine ab uno*
> *Disce omnes.**

II. Another word of a recent stamp was θυγάτηρ, which in Phalaris signifies *a maiden;* and I took that to be a manifest token of a later Greek: and, that it might not be suspected that I put a wrong meaning upon the word, I observed that even Tzetzes took it in the same sense that I do. But Mr. B., with the assistance of two Concordances, which shewed him the word θυγάτηρ in the *Old* and *New Testament,* has found out an answer. For he says, that in

[* Virg. *Æn.* ii. 65.—D.]

Prov. xxxi. 29., *Πολλαὶ θυγατέρες ἐκτήσαντο πλοῦτον, many daughters have got riches, θυγατέρες* must mean *women* or *maidens* (p. 67). Now, the original here is בנות *daughters;* and it's well known to any one that ever perused the *Septuagint*, that they often translate word for word, though the phrase that results from it be against the genius of the Greek tongue. This has so filled that version with Hebraisms, that one may affirm Demosthenes himself could not have thoroughly understood it; and the Greek Fathers oftentimes mistook the sense of it, for want of skill in the Hebrew. What does Mr. B. mean, then, by this instance out of *Proverbs?* For if his *Sicilian prince* have Hebraisms in his style, here's a new argument to shew him a cheat; and we must impeach him not only for Atticising, but for Hebraising too. But I'll leave Mr. B. to manage this new topic: and go on to his instances from the *New Testament;* where our Saviour says to the woman, *Θάρσει, θύγατερ· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole* (p. 67).[a] Where Mr. B. supposes *θύγατερ* means not properly *daughter*, but *woman*. Now, if we view this argument on every side, we shall find it in all respects worthy of its author. For, were it true here that *θύγατερ* means *woman*, it would be another Hebraism or Syriasm; which, instead of supporting Phalaris's credit, is enough to overthrow it. Nay, were it a genuine Greek phrase, this would still come very short of being a good answer. For I accuse this Sophist of a recent style, much later than the language of the true Phalaris's time; and Mr. B., in justification of him, brings a passage of the Evangelists, that come DC. years after Phalaris. But, if it will give him any satisfaction, I'll allow that the Sophist himself was as ancient as the Evangelists: no wonder, then, if the same use of the word *θυγάτηρ* should be found both in him and them. But yet I humbly conceive it would not follow, that the old Phalaris would use it so. But the worst of all is

[a] Mat. ix. 22. Mark, v. 34. Luke, viii. 48.

still behind, that θύγατερ in the *Gospels* does not signify *woman*, but properly and strictly *daughter*. For it was the common way in conversation, not only in the Eastern countries, but every where else, when persons of age and authority spoke kindly to their juniors, to say *son*, or *daughter*; and the others again used to say *father*, or *mother*; though there was no kindred at all between them. So Helena in Homer calls Telemachus *son*;

*Δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγὼ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι.**

And her husband Menelaus too accosts him in the same language;

Αἵματος εἶς ἀγαθοῖο, φίλον τέκος, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις.†

On the contrary, Euryalus greets Ulysses with the title of *father*;

Δεῦρ' ἄγε καὶ σὺ, ξεῖνε πάτερ, πείρησαι ἀέθλων.‡

And so Bacchis says to Chremes in Terence;

——— Asperum,
Pater, hoc est; aliud lenius sodes vide.§

There are other instances innumerable of this custom in conversation. Our Saviour therefore called the woman *daughter*, as Eli said to Samuel *my son*. But must we infer from thence that the words *son* and *daughter* may signify absolutely *man* and *woman*, as θυγάτηρ does in Phalaris? 'Tis an inference that may become Mr. B.; but if other authors should follow his fashion, it would sit but scurvily upon them. But he has another invention yet in reserve; and it's best to make way for him, for he seems to be in a rapture with it. *'Tis probable*, he says, *that in the more ancient MSS. of Phalaris it was written contractedly* θερας,

[* *Od.* xv. 125.—D.] [† *Od.* iv. 611.—D.]
[‡ *Od.* viii. 145., where Laodamas, not Euryalus, is the speaker.—D.]
[§ *Heaut.* III. i. 49.—D.]

which may be read either θυγατέρας or θεραπαίνας (p. 67). And being full blown with the opinion of his wonderful acuteness in discovering this rare expedient, *He will ask*, he says, *an* INSULTING *question, If our great dealer in MSS. did not observe this, where is his sagacity? if he observed it, without owning it, where is his sincerity?* Why, they are just *where* they were before this question was put; and I dare warrant that neither of them are in danger of being hurt by 't. For I deny that there's any such abbreviation used in any Greek MSS. as θερας for θεραπαίνας. This the Examiner should have first proved, before he pretended to argue from it. But he'll never be able to do that, nor to produce one single instance, no not out of all the MSS. of the Bodley. For abbreviations were never made use of but in words that come frequently; so that both labour and room was saved by their repeated contractions: as πρ was written for πατὴρ, ανος for ἄνθρωπος; and in the old copies of the Bible, θς, κς, χς, for θεὸς, κύριος, χριστὸς, because those words come in almost in every verse. But if a writer should abbreviate such words as θεραπαίνας, which scarce comes once in a whole book, he would save himself but one moment's labour, and make his copy unintelligible. 'Tis a mere dream, then, of our Examiner, to think θερας may stand for θεραπαίνας: and 'tis just as if he should say that πρ may stand for πρηστὴρ, or ανος for ἀνθέρικος. So seasonably has he put his *insulting* question, at a time when he may think he comes very well off, if himself be not insulted on.

III. Another instance of language which the true Phalaris would not have used was παίδων ἐρασταί; for the Sophist speaks of *parents who love their own children;* but in the old time those words had a lewd signification. But to this the gentleman replies, *that to him the argument seems to lie quite the other way. For in later times the words were scandalous, so that a Sophist would not have put 'em in Phalaris's mouth; but in Phalaris's time the expression might*

be innocent (p. 65). True, a Sophist of learning and good sense would have put proper words in the Tyrant's mouth; but this sorry declaimer, as he has committed many worse blunders, so he might be guilty of this. We may know his character, from that wretched ignorance of history and antiquity which he so often discovers; and 'tis a just punishment upon him to have such translators and such defenders. But let us see how Mr. B. proves that in the true Phalaris's time the words had an innocent meaning. *When Phalaris,* he says, *would express the scandalous love of boys, he does not use this word, as later authors do; for he calls Lycinus πόρνον ἐν παισὶ, but not παιδεραστὴν* (p. 65). Here our learned Examiner takes πόρνος ἐν παισὶ to be equivalent to παιδεραστής; and so indeed his translation expresses it, *cum pueris scortatorem esse.*[b] But his Assistant methinks might have taught him better; that πόρνος is not *scortator,* but *scortum, cinædus.* Had he ever read Æschines's *Oration against Timarchus,* he would have met with a dozen instances; and indeed it's never taken in any other sense. The true version, therefore, of πόρνον ἐν παισὶ is *inter pueros cinædum, a catamite when you was a boy.* So that this argument, instead of shewing that the Sophist would *put proper words in Phalaris's mouth,* has only shewn that a late Editor puts improper words in the Sophist's mouth.

To convince Mr. B. that παιδεραστὴς had no innocent meaning even so early as Phalaris's time, Solon, a contemporary of the Tyrant's, forbade it by law to all servants. *He made a law,* says Plutarch,[c] *Δοῦλον μὴ ξηραλοιφεῖν, μηδὲ παιδεραστεῖν, that servants should not love boys.* And that the vile practice of it was in Sicily then, as well as in Athens, Mr. B., who believes the *Epistles* genuine, may be satisfied from the IV., which we have newly cited; for if Lycinus was πόρνος, there was somebody else παιδεραστής. And they that have a lower opinion of those *Epistles* may be convinced of it by another token, because Chariton and

[b] Ep. iv. [c] Plut. Solone.

Melanippus, two Agrigentines and conspirators against Phalaris, are infamous for *παιδεραστία*, though the devil's oracle celebrated them for it;[d]

Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφυ,
Θείας ἡγητῆρες ἐφημερίοις φιλότητος.

But Mr. B. further objects, *that παίδων ἐρασταὶ and παιδεραστὰ sound very differently* (p. 65). Musically argued indeed! there's a very *sounding* syllable, *ων*, that makes them differ extremely. But we'll allow Mr. B. to be a good judge of *sounds*, if he'll allow others to be tolerable judges of *sense;* and in that the words are so exactly alike, that the nicest writers never thought of distinguishing them. Æschines, therefore, when he speaks of the same law of Solon, does not use *παιδεραστεῖν*, as Plutarch does, but *παιδὸς ἐρᾷν*:[e] and even Plutarch himself in another place expresses it so, *Δούλοις ἐρᾷν ἀῤῥένων παίδων ἀπεῖπε.*[f] Let them sound, then, never so differently, they are equivalent we see in signification.

Mr. B. concludes this point with what he thinks to be his strongest defence; *that παιδεραστὴς is used in Plato in a virtuous sense* (p.66). True, perhaps; but let us see how he proves it. Why, he brings a passage out of Plato's *Symposion, Πάντως . . . ὁ τοιοῦτος παιδεραστής τε καὶ φιλεραστὴς γίγνεται.* But Mr. B. has once shewn us already,[g] how very skilful he is in Plato's writings; and his second essay upon them does not degenerate from his first. The matter lies thus: the subject of that dialogue of Plato's is an encomium of *love;* and each of the guests makes a set speech in its commendation. But we must not suppose that all the speeches are philosophical, and becoming the mouth of Socrates or Plato himself; but they are suited to the characters of the several persons that speak them. Some of them, therefore,

[d] See Athenæus [V. 179. *ed. Schw.*, where *ἀγητῆρες ἐφαμερίοις φιλότατος.*—D.], Ælian, Euseb. Præp. Evang.

[e] Æschin. c. Timarchum. *Δοῦλον ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς μὴ ἐρᾷν.*

[f] Plut. in *Ἐρωτικῷ.*

[g] See here, vol. i. p. 326.

are lewd enough, according to the company. For even Agatho himself, the master of the feast, was a catamite, as appears by the dialogue itself, and by the old comedians and others. Among the rest, then, Aristophanes the comic poet is introduced, making an oration about love. And he tells a long fable, that at first mankind were all made double, with two heads, four arms, four legs, &c., and there were three sorts of them, some were double men, some double women, and some hermaphrodites. Afterwards, upon some offence they had committed, Jupiter split them all into two's; from whence arises now in mankind that natural desire of some companion, as his other half, to perfect his being; and even all the varieties of that desire proceed from the same cause. For of those that in the former state were hermaphrodites, the male half still desires the woman, and all such are now lovers of women, and adulterers; and the female half desires the man, and such are lovers of men, and adulteresses. But of those that in the original state were double men, both the halves now are lovers of males; so that when young they are catamites, and when grown up they are *παιδεραστα*ὶ, lovers of boys: and of those that were double women, both are now *ἑταιρίστριαι*, women lovers of women. This is the substance of Aristophanes's speech; and as it's observed by some of the ancients, that Plato in his *Symposion* makes Aristophanes have a drunken hiccough, taking that revenge upon the poet for abusing his master Socrates; so I am persuaded, that from the same motive he has put such a speech in that poet's mouth, as shews him to be, what he really was, a very debauched fellow. And is not Mr. B., now, a man of wonderful judgment, to produce a passage out of this speech of Aristophanes, as an instance that *παιδεραστὴς* has *a virtuous sense?* What sort of *sense* was in himself, then, I leave others to judge. For if the *παιδεραστα*ὶ there has an innocent meaning, by the same rule the *μοιχοὶ*, and *μοιχεύτριαι*, and *ἑταιρίστριαι*, must be harmless names too, which perhaps Mr. B. will not be willing to affirm. But he says, *that the speaker himself professes*

Melanippus, two Agrigentines and conspirators against Phalaris, are infamous for *παιδεραστία*, though the devil's oracle celebrated them for it;[d]

> *Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφυ,*
> *Θείας ἡγητῆρες ἐφημερίοις φιλότητος.*

But Mr. B. further objects, *that παίδων ἐρασταὶ and παιδερασταὶ sound very differently* (p. 65). Musically argued indeed! there's a very *sounding* syllable, *ων*, that makes them differ extremely. But we'll allow Mr. B. to be a good judge of *sounds*, if he'll allow others to be tolerable judges of *sense;* and in that the words are so exactly alike, that the nicest writers never thought of distinguishing them. Æschines, therefore, when he speaks of the same law of Solon, does not use *παιδεραστεῖν*, as Plutarch does, but *παιδὸς ἐρᾷν*:[e] and even Plutarch himself in another place expresses it so, *Δούλοις ἐρᾷν ἀῤῥένων παίδων ἀπεῖπε.*[f] Let them sound, then, never so differently, they are equivalent we see in signification.

Mr. B. concludes this point with what he thinks to be his strongest defence; *that παιδεραστὴς is used in Plato in a virtuous sense* (p.66). True, perhaps; but let us see how he proves it. Why, he brings a passage out of Plato's *Symposion, Πάντως . . . ὁ τοιοῦτος παιδεραστής τε καὶ φιλεραστὴς γίγνεται.* But Mr. B. has once shewn us already,[g] how very skilful he is in Plato's writings; and his second essay upon them does not degenerate from his first. The matter lies thus: the subject of that dialogue of Plato's is an encomium of *love;* and each of the guests makes a set speech in its commendation. But we must not suppose that all the speeches are philosophical, and becoming the mouth of Socrates or Plato himself; but they are suited to the characters of the several persons that speak them. Some of them, therefore,

[d] See Athenæus [V. 179. *ed. Schw.*, where *ἀγητῆρες ἐφαμερίοις φιλότατος.*—D.], Ælian, Euseb. Præp. Evang.

[e] Æschin. c. Timarchum. *Δοῦλον ἐλευθέρου παιδὸς μὴ ἐρᾷν.*

[f] Plut. in *Ἐρωτικῷ.*

[g] See here, vol. i. p. 326.

are lewd enough, according to the company. For even Agatho himself, the master of the feast, was a catamite, as appears by the dialogue itself, and by the old comedians and others. Among the rest, then, Aristophanes the comic poet is introduced, making an oration about love. And he tells a long fable, that at first mankind were all made double, with two heads, four arms, four legs, &c., and there were three sorts of them, some were double men, some double women, and some hermaphrodites. Afterwards, upon some offence they had committed, Jupiter split them all into two's; from whence arises now in mankind that natural desire of some companion, as his other half, to perfect his being; and even all the varieties of that desire proceed from the same cause. For of those that in the former state were hermaphrodites, the male half still desires the woman, and all such are now lovers of women, and adulterers; and the female half desires the man, and such are lovers of men, and adulteresses. But of those that in the original state were double men, both the halves now are lovers of males; so that when young they are catamites, and when grown up they are *παιδεραστοὶ*, lovers of boys: and of those that were double women, both are now *ἑταιρίστριαι*, women lovers of women. This is the substance of Aristophanes's speech; and as it's observed by some of the ancients, that Plato in his *Symposion* makes Aristophanes have a drunken hiccough, taking that revenge upon the poet for abusing his master Socrates; so I am persuaded, that from the same motive he has put such a speech in that poet's mouth, as shews him to be, what he really was, a very debauched fellow. And is not Mr. B., now, a man of wonderful judgment, to produce a passage out of this speech of Aristophanes, as an instance that *παιδεραστὴς* has *a virtuous sense?* What sort of *sense* was in himself, then, I leave others to judge. For if the *παιδεραστοὶ* there has an innocent meaning, by the same rule the *μοιχοὶ*, and *μοιχεύτριαι*, and *ἑταιρίστριαι*, must be harmless names too, which perhaps Mr. B. will not be willing to affirm. But he says, *that the speaker himself professes*

afterwards that he meant not those words of a lascivious love (p. 66.): which is just after his usual way, to defend one error by another. For the very words that he cites there prove the contrary to what he draws from them. Aristophanes, to make the fable he had told look probable, describes some instances of such vehement lovers, that the one cannot live at ease one moment out of the other's company. In which cases, says he, the pleasure of venery does not seem a competent cause of it; but the true reason is, that every such couple were the numerical halves that made up one complete person in the former state; whereby they have such a natural propension to one another, that, if it were possible, they would be one body again. Is it not evident here, now, that *a lascivious love* is supposed, only it is not allowed as an adequate cause? Read but Aristophanes's own plays, and the character that's given of him in this very *Symposion*,[h] and then say if his meaning can be so chaste here.*

We have seen now what a rare commentator upon Plato our learned Examiner is; and *I shall leave him to be scourged* (p. 66.), not only by the Platonists, as he did me, but by every one that understands good sense and decorum. But yet, after all, I am far from asserting that παιδεραστὴς and παιδικὰ are never innocently meant in Plato and other Socratical writers. For the word was used by them metaphorically; and though it had better been let alone, and no scandal been

[h] Ἀριστοφανὴς, ᾧ περὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἀφροδίτην πᾶσα διατριβή.

[* On Eurip. *Supplic.* v. 1088. (1098.) Παίδων τ' ἐραστὴς ἦν, Markland observes: "Suspiciosæ significationis locutio videri potest. nam παίδων ἐραστὴς "nefario sensu ponit Aristophanes Plut. 154. eodem quo παιδεραστὴς: et alii. "Cl. Bentleius ex hac locutione παίδων ἐραστὴς argumentum duxerat contra τὴν "γνησιότητα Epistolarum Phalaridis. Hic locus Phalaridem defendit, satis "aliunde reprehensibilem. Necesse est ut παίδων hoc loco idem sit quod "τέκνων, *liberorum*, non *puerorum*, *a lover or desirer of children*." To this passage of Markland's commentary the following note is added in the ed. of 1811: "Confer Ion. 67. Ἥκουσι πρὸς μαντεῖ' Ἀπόλλωνος τάδε, Ἔρωτι παίδων. "Dan. 6. Οὗτος δ' ἔρωτι παιδὸς ἀρσενὸς σχεθεὶς. Ion. 1246. Παίδων γὰρ ἐλθοῦσ' "εἰς ἔρον Φοίβου πάρα. PORSONUS." D.]

given by it, yet in [it]self the metaphor was proper and just. For a philosopher may be said to be the true *παίδων ἐραστής*, in opposition to the others; since what they admire in beauty out of impure lust, he loves and reverences as an image of the divine beauty. But even this is a certain argument that *παίδων ἐρασταὶ* could not in those ages signify *lovers of their* OWN *children*, (as it does in Phalaris's *Epistles*,) no not metaphorically. Because there was nothing to take such a metaphor from; for though sodomy was an epidemical vice in those unhappy ages of the world, yet the abomination of a father with his own son, such a horrid mixture of sodomy and incest, was never spoken of even then, nor had any name. Nay, though we should suppose that such a complicate wickedness had been practised among them, yet the name would have been even then accounted too foul and abominable to be employed for a modest metaphor.

IV. Mr. B. has had the privilege of committing a great number of mistakes; and, upon a review, I do not find he has yet made out that I have writ one single word amiss, except where, by a small slip of the memory, *Buda* was put for *Belgrade*. Four hundred pages, then, have been all spent in refuting his abuses and errors; a very great exercise both of patience and good-nature. For a recompense of all which tedious labour, I desire but one small favour of him, *that he'll give me leave to make the next mistake:* I'll promise him it shall be no shameful one, and it shall be the only time I'll trouble him in this way, in all the controversy that I have with him. Among the words that I believed had an innovated sense in the *Epistles* of Phalaris, there were *προδίδωμι, to give beforehand*, and *διώκω, to follow as a friend, not as a pursuer*. I could not call to mind at that time any old writer that had used them so; and the press staying for more copy (for the whole *Dissertation* was carried thither leaf by leaf, while the ink was scarce dry on them), I had no leisure to make any search. I will freely

own, therefore, to Mr. B., that my memory, which is none of the best, deceived me here. For I had formerly read those very passages that he produces, and when I read them I understood them in the same meaning that he does, though at that time they were quite out of my mind.

But though I was mistaken by a deceitful memory, yet the glory that Mr. B. acquires by correcting the error is too light to be put in the balance against his faults. Though I shall not go about to make it less, but give him and his admirers leave to magnify it as much as they can. He has told me, *that I expose myself to be corrected by every one that can turn an index or a lexicon* (p. 68). And, to explain himself, he adds in his margin this passage of Quintilian;[i] which serves for no other purpose there, but to shew he understood it not. For Quintilian does not speak of such *indexes* as books have now-a-days; but, after he had named several of the Greek poets, Homer, Antimachus, Euphorion, &c., *I pass over the names of the rest*, says he, *for there's nobody so destitute of the means of knowing them, but he may copy the catalogue of them out of a library*. This shews us, that, in those days too, the libraries had catalogues of the books belonging to them; but what relation has that to *lexicons* and our modern *indexes?* Mr. B. presently excuses himself for *the multitude of quotations* that fill the margin of *that odd work of his*. And indeed, after such a citation from Quintilian, it was very seasonable to beg that pardon, though upon another account than he was aware of. But, to forgive our Examiner this blunder, 'tis very true what he says, *that a man that can turn an index or a lexicon* might easily correct those mistakes of mine. For those significations of διώκω and προδίδωμι, which I had then forgot, are taken notice of in the Greek *Concordances* and Constantine's *Lexicon*. Mr. B., then, has taught the world nothing, nor improved learning in any sort; for the things

[i] Quint. x. 1. Nec sanè quisquam est tam procul à cognitione eorum remotus, ut non indicem certè ex bibliothecâ sumptum transferre in libros suos possit.

were known, we see, a hundred years ago. And it's pretty remarkable, that, after all the clamour of the Examiner, and some inferior tools that have seconded him, *that I know nothing but out of indexes and lexicons*;[j] yet the only mistake that their united learning could convict me of, had been avoided, if I really were such a turner of *indexes* and *lexicons*.

A mistake through mere forgetfulness, and but once or very seldom committed, has been always esteemed one of the best sort, and to leave the least blemish upon the author. For if that were enough to disgrace a writer, nobody could escape the infamy, except those that were inspired. If I do not make false judgments of things, and if I reason truly from premises, for a bare error of the memory I shall not be solicitous, but fairly trust my reputation to the present age and posterity. Whatever the world shall think of my performances, I shall acquiesce in the censure. As I do not write books for fame, so I am not concerned about the reception they shall meet with;

——Valeat res ludicra, si me
*Palma negata macrum, donata reducit opimum.**

However, when I consider what the things are that among the best judges raise or depress the character of a man of letters, I had much rather be found guilty of forgetting those unusual significations of προδίδωμι and διώκω, than of managing the matter as Mr. B. has done. For, of eight examples that he has brought of the latter of those words, six are nothing to the purpose. The thing that I had said was this, that διώκω then only signified *to pursue, when that which fled feared and shunned the pursuer:* as where Achilles pursues Hector in Homer;

[j] Virum in volvendis lexicis satis diligentem. [From the Preface to Alsop's *Fabularum Æsopicarum Delectus:* see note on Bentley's Preface to the present work, p. xliv.—D.]

[* Hor. *Epist.* II. i. 180.—D.]

Τῇ ῥα παραδραμέτην, φεύγων, ὁ δ' ὄπισθε διώκων·
*Πρόσθε μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔφευγε, δίωκε δέ μιν μέγ' ἀμείνων.**

And Mr. B., in refutation of this, has produced six instances where διώκω does not at all mean *to pursue*, but, in a metaphorical sense, *to desire, to court, to seek*. And what are all these to the point? I spoke of that sense of διώκω *when* it signifies *to pursue*. 'Twas the very supposition, that it had the meaning of *pursuing;* which notion, when it belonged to it, was accompanied, as I then thought, with another of *being shunned*. As for the figurative sense of *desiring* and *seeking*, that I had not forgot, for 'tis the most common acceptation of it. The only true way, then, to answer me was, to bring an instance where it means a *pursuit*, but yet without being *shunned;* as when one friend *pursues* or *follows after* another. And I own that two of his instances plainly prove this; but the other six, that are all metaphor, among which are those out of Scripture, are not at all pertinent to the business; and they are a greater evidence of his bad judgment than mine are of my bad memory.

Mr. B. makes a mighty outcry (p. 62, 63.), as if my forgetting a Greek word in the *Septuagint* or the *New Testament* was to subvert the authority of them: *and he has an inquiry to make of me, whether I think my Philosophical Lectures serve more to the establishment of religion than my criticisms do to overthrow it?* (p. 67, 68.) The gentleman has told us what disposition he's of, for he thinks *ridicule the most diverting thing in the world* (p. 285). But, I humbly conceive that he had better employ his talent at *grimace* and *banter* upon other occasions than where the Scripture is concerned. For it shews no great reverence to those sacred writings, to bring them, though it be but as accessaries, into farce and ridicule. And perhaps it's no great discretion in him to cast such an oblique slur upon my *Lectures against Atheism*. They were preached upon an

[* *Il.* xxii. 157.—D.]

establishment of the great and good Mr. Boyle, to whom this gentleman has the honour to be related; and though they are much below what I could wish them, and what the subject of them deserves, yet the world has received them favourably, and they are translated into more languages than one. He had better, therefore, have omitted this little affront upon those sermons; lest the readers, calling to mind the founder of that lecture, should be invited to make a comparison between him and another of his name.

The most excellent Bishop Pearson had designed a new edition of Ignatius's *Epistles*, with an ample commentary; a specimen of which posthumous work has been published by the learned Dr. Smith, and the whole is earnestly expected from him. For though it has not passed the last hand of the author, yet it's every way worthy of him, and the very dust of his writings is gold. In that published specimen there is this annotation upon the words of Ignatius, *ΤΟΝ ΥΜΑΣ ΣΟΦΙΣΑΝΤΑ. Vox Paulina, ex* 2 *Tim.* iii. 15. *Τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν.* Quæ te possunt sapientem reddere. *Neque ante eum vox activa eo sensu reperitur cum accusativo personæ.* Where the Bishop positively affirms, *that σοφίζειν, in the acceptation of* making wise, *is a word of St. Paul's framing; for before him nobody used it in that sense.* But in this his memory deceived him; for, as Dr. Smith observed to me, there is the very same use of the word in *Psalm* xviii. 8. [7.] *Ἡ μαρτυρία Κυρίου πιστὴ σοφίζουσα νήπια*: and *Psal.* civ. 22. *Καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους αὐτοῦ σοφίσαι.** What shall we say now to this? for the Bishop's case is exactly mine. His lordship had forgot one word in the Bible, and I had forgot another. Will the Examiner insult upon that great man, as he has done upon me? I will only change the persons, and we'll see how his *insulting* and *grimace* becomes him. *The Bishop avers that St. Paul is the first that uses σοφίζειν for* making wise.

[* "Hesiod. Opp. et D. 649. [647. *ed. Gaisford. P. M. G.* i.—D.] σεσο-"φισμένος." PORSON, *in his Tracts, &c. ed. by Kidd*, p. 316.—D.]

What shall we do then for the Septuagint? At this rate, that translation must come after St. Paul; so that the writings that carry their names must be CCC. *years younger than we Christians suppose 'em. And that version ascribed to the* LXX. *cannot be an ancient work, but was penned by some recent Sophist. What shall we say to this? Shall we allow Bishop Pearson to be a scurvy critic, or shall we, in tenderness to his honour, give up our Greek Bibles? Perhaps the Bishop may for this once be mistaken* (p. 62.*): *but I have one inquiry more to make of him on this occasion, and that is this, Whether he thinks his* Exposition of the Creed *serves more to the establishment of religion than his criticisms do to overthrow it? For is he not positive that σοφίζειν in that sense was first used by St. Paul? And is not the very same word in the same sense to be met with twice in the Septuagint? Should not so profound a Grecian and divine as he is have looked a little into the Old Testament, before he had pronounced such rash and groundless assertions? Could men imagine one who writes at this rate to have any meaning, they would think he had a very ill one; but the whole management of his controversies clears him from all suspicions of meaning and design* (p. 67). These are the very words of Mr. B., only the Bishop and his writings are substituted for me and mine: not that I make any comparison of my poor papers with that great man's incomparable works; but I would shew that Mr. B.'s argument holds alike against us both. And Mr. B. must needs acknowledge now that *I have one good page* (Pref.) in this edition of my *Dissertation*, as well as I had in the former; for, being his own, I think I know his humour so well, that he cannot but be pleased with it.

But, to put an end to this article. The only thing that Mr. B. has said well upon this head is about the meaning of two words; which may prove, indeed, that I was mistaken,

[* Old ed. "P. 60."—a mistake, as I find by referring to Boyle's book. —D.]

but it does not at all defend his Phalaris. For of the five words that I instanced in, the greater part do still keep their ground: and if two strings be broken, here are three yet left, that will hold as strongly as all the five. If the *Sicilian prince*, therefore, has no better a champion than Mr. B. is, his case will still appear to be desperate. For the wild question that the Examiner puts to me, *How do you know but those words might be in use in Phalaris's time, and be dropped afterwards when the learned age came on, and be revived again as that declined* (p. 61.)? though it deserve no answer, yet it has one. For we know from the laws of Solon, who was Phalaris's contemporary, that the language of the *Epistles* was not the language of that time. Nay, though we had not those remains of Solon's to shew, Mr. B.'s suppositions would still be very infirm ones. For here are three revolutions of the same words, *used, dropped, revived,* that are all precariously supposed, without any manner of proof. A way of argumentation that some *young writers* (Pref.) may make a dust with, but then their works will hardly live to be old ones.

XIV.

But, should we connive at his using the Attic dialect, and say not a word of those flaws and innovations in his style, yet there is one thing still, that, I fear, will more difficultly be forgiven him, that is, a very slippery way in telling of money. This is a tender point, and will make every body shy and cautious of entertaining him. In the LXXXV. Epistle he talks of a *hundred talents*, τάλαντα ἑκατόν; of fifteen more, in the CXVIII.; eight, in the CXXXVII.; seven, in the CIV.; five, in the CXLIII.; and three in the XCV. These affairs being transacted in the middle of Sicily, and all the persons concerned being natives and in-

habitants there, who would not be ready to conclude that he meant the *talent* of the country? since he gives not the least hint of his meaning a foreign sum. If a bargain were made in England, to pay so many pounds or marks, and the party should pretend at last that he meant Scots marks or French livres, few, I suppose, would care to have dealings with him. Now, this is the very case in so many of these *Letters.* In the LXXth, indeed, he is more punctual with Polyclitus his physician; for he speaks expressly of Attic money, *μυριάδας Ἀττικὰς πέντε,* 50,000 *Attic drachms.* But this is so far from excusing him, that it is a plain condemnation out of his own mouth. For if it was necessary to tell Polyclitus that he meant the Attic money, and not the Sicilian, why had he not the same caution and ingenuity towards all the rest? We are to know, that in Sicily, as in most other countries, the name and value of their coins, and the way of reckoning by sums, were peculiar. The sum *talent* in the Sicilian account contained no more in specie than three Attic drachms, or Roman denares; as plainly appears from Aristotle,[k] in his now lost treatise of the *Sicilian Governments.* And the words of Festus are most express; *There are several sorts of talents: the Attic contains* 6000 *denares, the Syracusan* 3 *denares.*[l] What an immense difference! One Attic talent had the real value of two thousand Sicilian talents. Now, in all these *Epistles,* the very circumstances assure us, that by the word *talent,* simply

[k] Pollux, lib. ix. c. 6. [p. 1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[l] Talentorum non unum genus: Atticum est sex millium denarium . . . . Syracusanum trium denarium.

named, the Attic talent is understood. But should not our wise Sophist have known that a *talent*, in that country where he had laid the scene of his *Letters*, was quite another thing? Without question, if the true Phalaris had penned them, he would have reckoned these sums by the Sicilian talents, increasing only the number: or, should he have made use of the Attic account, he would always have given express notice of it, never saying τάλαντον alone, without the addition of Ἀττικόν.

The Examiner enters upon this article with such an air of satisfaction, as carries in it an assurance of victory. *If the Dr.*, says he, *can make this out, I promise to renounce the whole set of* Epistles (p. 73). Now, here's fair encouragement for me to take pains, since if I can carry this single point, I shall have the honour of making by it so illustrious a proselyte. But, if we consider that extraordinary zeal that he shews all along for his *Sicilian prince*, we may look upon this as a *defiance* rather than a *promise*. Nay, I am informed that this part in particular is by some others, as well as by himself, believed to be unanswerable; nay, that some have proceeded so far in its commendation, as to suspect that it was not written by the same hand that made the rest of the book. But I shall do the Examiner that piece of service to clear him of that hard censure upon account of this admired chapter; for I will prove it's no better than the rest of the performance, but every paragraph in't either mistake or false reasoning, from beginning to end.

Before he comes to the business itself, he will shew us how captious he can be, and how expert at chicanery. He would ridicule my comparison of the *Sicilian talent* in Phalaris to the *Scots marks* and *French livres*. *For the case*, he says, *is just contrary* (p. 74). Now, the ground of my comparison was this: by the spurious Phalaris, the reader is

made at first to believe that great sums of money are expended, ten talents and a hundred talents; but when he comes to look narrowly into the matter, he finds he's deceived, for the Sicilian talent must be intended, if he be the true Phalaris, and by that means the account will fall and dwindle from a hundred pounds sterling to a single shilling. Let the reader be judge now, if the comparison was not just. But he asks me, *What cloudy author had I been conversing with, that could give this perverse turn to my imagination?* If conversation *with a cloudy author* would necessarily *confound* a man's head, Mr. B. might be secure, for his book could never be answered. But I hope that, notwithstanding that dangerous *conversation* that I have had with it for some time, I can yet be able to *clear up* all the puzzling and perplexed stuff that he has brought or can bring against me.

But first it may not be improper, for the satisfaction of such as read not Phalaris's *Epistles*, to shew the Attic talent must be meant there, value 180*l.* English; not the Sicilian talent, which is no more than five groats. I suppose here, as I did above,[m] that the Attic pound weight of XII. ounces is equal to an English one; so that a mina, weighing XII. ounces of silver, may be reckoned equal to three pounds sterling. There's no need of greater exactness in our present calculations. Now, the Tyrant is introduced complaining that the Catanians, by an incursion into his territories, had plundered him of VII. talents;[n] which, if they be supposed Attic talents, make 1260*l.* sterling, but if Sicilian but 12*s.* 7*d.*, too small a sum for a *prince* to be concerned at. In another place, out of great liberality, he gives V. talents for a lady's portion;[o] which in Attic is 900*l.* sterling, but in Sicilian 9*s.*, too small a fortune for a lady of her quality. There are more instances of this sort: and in several places too he names δραχμαὶ, *drachms*, which were no Sicilian money.

[m] See here, vol. i. p. 400. [n] Ep. 104. [o] Ep. 143.

Mr. B. begins with an attack against the credit of my witnesses, Pollux, Festus, and Aristotle (p. 75, 76). And first he cavils at my calling Aristotle's book a treatise of the *Sicilian Governments*. He owns Aristotle wrote *an account of the governments of the Sicilian cities* (as the *Πολίτεια Συρακουσίων, Ἱμεραίων, Ἀκραγαντίνων, Γελώων*, &c.), *but it does not appear that the book bore such a title.* But if that do not *appear*, something else plainly does, that Mr. B. was in great want of arguments, when he descended to such trifling exceptions. Among which I must reckon what he says against the authority of Pollux, *that one of Seberus's MSS. wanted those pages whence this passage is cited; so that there's room to doubt whether it be genuine* (p. 76). But it was extant in the MS. from which Aldus first printed the book; and in a MS. of the late Is. Vossius's, a transcript of which I have by me; and in the Palatine MS. used by Salmasius.[p] The same Seberus informs us, that one of his MSS. wanted all the IV. last books, and two of them wanted VIII.: will Mr. B. therefore discard all those, and leave us two only of the ten? And is it not something like a riddle, that so small a hole will *make room* for him to *doubt* if Pollux's passage be *genuine;* and yet no room is wide enough to let him doubt if his Phalaris be genuine?

But, allowing the passage to be Pollux's own, yet *we are told there,* he says, *that a Sicilian talent is equal to* XII. *νοῦμμοι, and a νοῦμμος equal to three ὁμόλια; which ὁμόλια is a corrupted word, and must be helped out by a correction: so that all that we can talk from Pollux about the nummus and the talent is bottomed upon a mere conjecture* (p. 77). But this objection of the Examiner is bottomed upon a mistake of his own; for the MS. of Vossius has it plainly *ἡμιωβόλια.* Nay, though all the copies were corrupted here, they would do the Examiner no service; because our accounts with Phalaris about his talents are not so nice as to depend upon *ὁμόλια* or *ἡμιωβόλια, a penny or three half pence.* For we

[p] Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 257.

know from another passage, which is not corrupted, that the νοῦμμος was *a single piece of silver*.[p] Let the piece then be as big as the Examiner dares suppose it; yet if the Sicilian talent contained but XII. of them, it is still vastly too low to be meant in the *Epistles*.

The next page is spent in telling us, "that those who "would settle the value of the Sicilian talent from its ad-"justment to XII. νοῦμμοι, SEEM to take it for granted that "νοῦμμος there means the Roman *nummus* or *sestertius*: "but it cannot be so, because the words are not Pollux's, "but Aristotle's, who lived before the Roman *sestertius* was "coined. So that the ground upon which the computation "of the talent SEEMS to be made plainly fails" (p. 78). What may *seem* to Mr. B.'s imagination is too wide to be measured and comprehended by mine. But I am persuaded there's not one writer extant that has given the least hint that he believed the *nummus* here was compared by Aristotle to the Roman *sestertius*. This is a dream, therefore, of the Examiner's; for he tells us, *'Tis no wonder if he should not be awake sometimes* (p. 203.); and he *seems* now to have been in one of his sleepy fits. The value of the Sicilian talent may be gathered from this passage thus: a talent was XII. νοῦμμοι, and every νοῦμμος was an *obolus* and a half. Now, six *oboli* make a drachm; so that four νοῦμμοι and a drachm are equivalent. If a talent, therefore, contain XII. νοῦμμοι, it must contain three drachms. Thus we see the Sicilian talent is adjusted in its value, as I had reckoned it before, without any consideration of the Roman *sestertius*.

But, *after all*, he says, *I have imposed upon people in my valuation* (p. 79). "For Aristotle mentions two sorts of "Sicilian talents; the old one, consisting of XXIV. νοῦμμοι, "the new one, of XII.; which small one I have followed in "my computations, though Phalaris must be supposed to "reckon by the most ancient." This indeed is very mate-

[p] Pollux, p. 436. [=1056, *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

rial, and I know not how to come off; for I have sunk the *prince's* expenses half in half. Let them be stated, then, as Mr. B. will have them: and so the Catanians plundered Phalaris of 1*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.*; and the lady's fortune, that he paid out of his coffers, came to 18*s.*; both which bills I had cut off in the middle. And is the matter now mended by this? or is my argument at all the weaker for't? Mr. B. shews himself to be a better steward of his master Phalaris's revenue than of his own reputation; for he owns *the point is not worth contending for.* But, however, it serves to fill a whole page, which is no inconsiderable service. The reason why of the two accounts that were both equal to my main purpose, I chose to follow the latter, was because Festus reckons the Syracusian talent by Aristotle's lower rate; so that two authors concurring in 't, I gave it the preference.

Mr. B. grows at last angry with Pollux himself, *and will give him no credit in this matter. For he cites such things here out of Aristotle as cannot be admitted, no, not upon Aristotle's own testimony* (p. 80). "As where he tells us "that the Sicilians reckoned δύο χαλκοῦς, two brass pieces, "to be equal to ἑξάλιτρα, six litræ, and six brass pieces to "be equal to half a litra. But how can two be XII. times "as many as six?" *Again,* says he, *to confound us the more,* he tells us, from the same Aristotle, "that ἓξ τά-"λαντα, six talents, are equal to two brass pieces, and that "τρία τάλαντα, three talents, are equal to three brass "pieces. But how can three be more than six?" Now, if this argument have any force in't, it must prove that Aristotle, or Pollux at least, could not count three, nor knew the difference between two and six. Mr. B. I dare say is the first man that disputed at this rate: and till such another Aristotle as he describes here comes into the world, perhaps he will be the last. The whole banter is only founded upon three false readings of Pollux, ἑξάλιτρα,[q] and ἓξ τά-

[q] Pollux, p. 216. [=454. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

λαντα, and τρία τάλαντα.[r] The two first belong to one and the same thing, and must both be corrected ἑξᾶντα, and the third τριᾶντα. So slight an emendation makes the whole passage consistent; and I shall shew by and by that it's both necessary and certain. *The* Examiner *must give me leave now and then to ask him* one of his own *questions*, though I will not give it, as he does, the epithet INSULTING; *If our great dealer in* spurious authors *did not observe this, where is his sagacity? If he observed it without owning it, where is his sincerity?* (p. 67.) One of the two will be very hard pressed; but for his sincerity I'll be voucher in this particular, because it's plain by his miserable offer at a correction, to be considered anon, that his sagacity *was not awake* here.

But he says, *Pollux in the same place informs us* (p. 81.), "that the talent of every country was divided into LX. minæ, "and each of those minæ into C. drachms. If the Sicilian "talent, then, was but three Attic drachms, the Sicilian "*mina* was no more than one English farthing and a half, "and the *drachm* not the LXVIth part of a farthing, and yet "in silver too;" *a species of money not to be counted without the help of microscopes: so that when we have occasion hereafter to express the value, or rather worthlessness, of any contemptible performance, we shall say it is not worth a Sicilian drachm.* I like the gentleman's motion well; and, since we can never have a better *occasion* of using this new *saying*, I must crave leave to tell him, that his own *performance* in this very paragraph is *contemptible, and not worth one of his* imaginary *Sicilian drachms.* For there's no such thing in Pollux as what the Examiner tells us from him, *that the talent of each country was divided into* LX. *minæ.* I will set down that author's words: *As the mina,* says he, *at Athens contained* C. *Attic drachms, so the minæ of other countries contained* C. *drachms of each country; which drachms were in value to the Attic drachm in the same*

[r] P. 436. [=1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

proportion as the talent of each (above mentioned) *was to the Attic talent.*[s] Here it's evident, from Pollux, that the mina of every country contained C. drachms, and the drachm of every country was the 6000th part of the talent of that country; but here is not the least hint that the talent of every country contained LX. minæ. These two, I humbly conceive, are very different propositions; though the Examiner, with his logic-system in his head, confounded them. Wherever there were such names of money as *minæ* and *drachms*, there was a talent; Pollux therefore observed truely, that in every country these two bore the same proportion to Attic *minæ* and *drachms* as talent did to talent. But then it is not true in the reverse, that wherever there was a talent, there were *minæ* and *drachms;* for in Sicily and the Doric colonies of Italy, Tarentum, Rhegium, Neapolis, there was a *talent*, but no such name, nor species, nor sum, as either *mina* or *drachm*. The talent there was not divided into minæ and drachms, but into *νούμμους*, *λίτρας*, *οὐγκίας*. Pollux, therefore, has quite separated his account of the Sicilian money from that of other nations;[t] but if the Sicilian talent had been divisible into *minæ* and *drachms*, as the other talents he there speaks of, he would certainly have included that too in his general estimation of talents. Let the reader now be judge, if the Examiner's performances here do not deserve his own new-invented expression, *not worth a Sicilian drachm*. Let him take it, then, to himself; for he tells us, that his *Sicilian prince* was celebrated for his justice, when he made Perillus handsel his own invention.[u] Mr. B., therefore, cannot complain, if he gives the first handsel to his; though the phrase carries a lower *worthlessness* in't than he was aware of. For he computed the Sicilian *drachm* to be the LXVIth part of an English farthing;

[s] Pollux, p. 437. [=1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.] *Ἡ μνᾶ δὲ ὡς παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἑκατὸν εἶχε δραχμὰς Ἀττικὰς, οὕτω καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις τὰς ἐπιχωρίους, δυναμένας πρὸς λόγον τοῦ καθ' ἑκάστους ταλάντου, κατά τε προσθήκην καὶ ὑφαίρεσιν.*

[t] Pollux, p. 437. [u] Præf. Phalar.

whereas now it plainly appears to be nothing at all, and exactly of the same value with an *Utopian drachm.*

Mr. B. in his margin quotes two very learned men, Brerewood and Gronovius, who affirm, he says, *that every talent contains* 6000 *drachms* (p. 81, 82). Now if this had really been their opinion, yet it had signified nothing here; for we do not go by authorities, but by truth. If they believed so, they were certainly mistaken; neither do Pollux and Suidas, the authors cited by Brerewood, say any such matter. But if Mr. B. had either been diligent or ingenuous here, he would have seen that it was only a loose expression of those two learned men, that dropped from them unawares; for Brerewood in the same page, and Gronovius in the same chapter, that Mr. B. has quoted, expressly affirm on my side, that the Sicilian talent was anciently six, and afterwards three denares. Mr. B. we see has another *obligation* here *to excuse himself to the reader for his multitude of quotations* (p. 68).

His next attempt is upon the passage of Festus, *Talentum Syracusanum trium denarium* (p. 83, 84.); which he ushers in with an harangue about Festus's Abridgment of Verrius Flaccus, and Paulus Diaconus's Abridgment of Festus; a story known to every body that have once looked into Festus. But what was this to his purpose? Let Paulus be as *mean a writer* as Mr. B. pleases; yet this passage is not cited from his Epitome, but from Festus himself. But Mr. B. will now tell us something, *which is more to his purpose, that all the editions of Festus take care to warn us, that for* Syracusanum trium denarium, *we ought to read* Syracusanum trium millium denarium; and thereupon, to make a show and a noise with, he crams his poor margin with half a dozen citations. Now, the thing is no more than this: the first editor of this passage of Festus, not understanding how a talent could be so little a sum as three denares, put that conjecture in the margin for an emendation, as he thought it; and so it has been continued since, and some of the editors have espoused it; for all editors, Mr. B. knows, are not infallible. But the

MS. copy of Festus, and the text of all the editions, represent it as it's quoted by me; and all the best writers about money have for this hundred years embraced it, Scaliger, Brerewood, Salmasius, Gronovius, &c.; and before this section is ended, it will be made out to be the true reading.

But he'll prove now, out of Sicilian writers, and those that speak of Sicilian affairs, that the talent of that country had not such a low value as I would assign to it out of Festus and Pollux (p. 85, 86, 87, 88.): but of all his authors there's but one that writes in the Sicilian dialect, and that is Theocritus; and he indeed mentions a *mina* as the price of a woman's gown, and VII. *drachms* paid for V. fleeces of wool; which cannot be of that low and small sort of drachms that Mr. B. has now discovered *by the help of his microscope*. Now, allowing what Mr. B. supposes, that Theocritus speaks here of Sicilian money, yet it ought to be considered that he lived near CCC. years after Phalaris's time, in which interval the species of money might be altered in Sicily. That the money of Syracuse, where Theocritus was born, was recoined in that time, is very certain. Aristotle informs us,[v] that Dionysius the First got all the money and riches of Syracuse into his hands in five years' time. And that having borrowed money of the citizens at interest, upon their demanding it, he ordered every man, upon the pain of death, to bring in all the money he had; and when the money was brought in, he recoined it, and made every piece of new money pass for double the former value, and so paid them out of their own silver.[w] So the Romans, in the first Punic war, recoined all their brass money, and made every ounce go for VI. times as much as it did before.[x] But Dionysius perhaps did not only recoin the money of Syracuse, but alter the species too and the names of it: for Aristotle there says he coined a *drachm*, which he put off

[v] Arist. Polit. v. 11.
[w] Arist. Œcon. ii. 20.
[x] Pliny, xxxiii. 3.

for a double drachm.[y] Now, we may gather from Aristotle himself, as Pollux has cited him, that among the old Sicilian money there was no such name as a *drachm*. Dionysius, therefore, or somebody before him, had altered the money at Syracuse, and had introduced the Greek species there. But perhaps we ought not to take Aristotle's words so strictly and literally in this place. In his accounts of the Sicilian Governments, whence Pollux has his citations, he was obliged to use the words of the country; but in his *Economics* he might take the common liberty of writers, to reduce the Sicilian money to some equivalent of the Attic. By the *drachm*, therefore, of Dionysius, he may mean perhaps the Sicilian *δεκάλιτρον*, or denare, and express it by the name of *drachm*, as known among the Grecians, and about the same value. But let this be as every one pleases; I suppose it will be allowed, that in CCC. years' time the species of money might be altered in Sicily; as in England, by the late great restitution of our coin, the species called nine-pences and four-pence half-pennies are gone, and perhaps may never be reduced into use again. What Aristotle, therefore, tells us about the old Sicilian money cannot be refuted from the species of Theocritus's time, or any that come after him.

Besides this, I have another answer to this instance from Theocritus, for the poet does not speak of Sicilian money. The passages that Mr. B. cites are out of the xvth *Idyllium*;*

Γο. Πραξινόα, μάλα τοι τὸ καταπτυχὲς ἐμπερόναμα
Τοῦτο πρέπει· λέγε μοι, πόσσω κατέβα τοι ἀφ' ἱστῶ;
Πρ. Μὴ μνάσῃς, Γοργοῖ· πλέον ἀργυρίω καθαρῶ μνᾶν
Ἢ δύο—

And again;†

Χὠμὸς ταῦτά γ' ἔχει, φθόρος ἀργυρίου, Διοκλείδας·

[y] Δραχμὴν δύο δυναμένην δραχμάς.

[* v. 34.—D.] [† v. 18.—D.]

Ἑπτὰ δραχμῶν κυνάδας, γραῖαν ἀποτίλματα πηρῶν,
*Πέντε πόκως ἔλαβ' ἐχθὲς, ἅπαν ῥύπος, ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ.**

Where it's owned that *minæ* and *drachms* are spoken of; but who are the persons that speak? Mr. B. tells us *they are Syracusian ladies.* No wonder that he has made ladies of two women of low rank; for he made a *king* Zaleucus from a shepherd; and to go to the palace to see a sight there, like the king's fine coach, is in Mr. B.'s language *to appear at court.* But to let that pass; pray, where are these *ladies* when they say this? I must declare here my astonishment at the conduct of our Examiner; and it seems to me to be wholly unaccountable, unless I have recourse again to that fatality of mistaking that he seems to lie under. What, was he *not awake* here neither, that he could not see the scene of this *Idyllium* was not at Syracuse in Sicily, but at Alexandria in Ægypt? The *Idyllium* itself, had he ever read it, would have told him this over and over;

Βᾶμες τῶ βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀφνειῶ Πτολεμαίω.†

Let's go to king Ptolemy's court, says one woman to the other; and so away they foot it, and return home before *dinner.* Now, if they lived in the same city, this journey of theirs is feasible; but to go from Syracuse to Alexandria and back again in a morning, and on foot too over the sea, is a stretch something extraordinary. To be short with the Examiner; they were natives indeed of Syracuse, but they had removed to Alexandria, and there they had husbands, and children, and servants, and dwelling-houses. All this appears from the very poem; and that Mr. B. may not say, that the minæ and drachms here were laid out upon clothes

[* The later editors of Theocritus agree in giving *ταὐτά* and *ἀργυρίω* in the first line, *πηρᾶν* in the second, and *ῥύπον* in the third. Instead of *Ἑπτὰ δραχμῶν* in the second line, Bentley (p. 45.) prefers *Ἑπταδράχμως*, which Gaisford (*P. M. G.*) also gives: but see Toup, *Epist. ad Wart.* p. 320.; Valckenaer *ad l.* (*Theoc. Decem Eidyl.*); and Kiessling *ad l.*—D.]

[† v. 22., where *ἐς ἀφ.*—D.]

at Syracuse, before their departure from thence, the very verse that he cites will teach him the contrary, *Πέντε πόκως ἔλαβ' ΕΧΘΕΣ*, YESTERDAY *my husband laid out* VII. *drachms upon wool.* But if Mr. B. shall pretend to have known that the scene of all this was at Alexandria, *where was his sagacity,* that he could not see the Alexandrian money must be meant, and not that of their old country Sicily? If a French refugee drives a bargain here at London with sixpences and shillings, will Mr. B. infer from it that those species are the money of France too? Here's another of his *performances not worth a Sicilian drachm:* and his facetious computation, *that the* VII. *drachms in Theocritus must be short of the eighth part of a farthing, if they were paid in the Dr.'s money* (p. 87.), must, like the rest of his assertions, be interpreted backwards, and then it will be true. For, *in the Dr.'s account* they were *Alexandrian drachms,* and consequently not lower than the common Attic drachms, but double their value.

But Mr. B. will scatter his learning occasionally, besides what he bestows upon his main subject. He acquaints us that in the first passage, *πλέον ἀργυρίω καθαρῶ μνᾶν Ἢ δύο, H. Stephanus in the margin reads it μνᾶς* (p. 86.): and accordingly Mr. B. translates it, *it costs somewhat more than a mina or two* (p. 87.); as if the original was *πλέον μνᾶς ἢ δύο.* And, to allow Mr. B. all the favour we can, the Latin versions have interpreted it so before him, *plus minâ unâ et alterâ, plus minâ unâ vel duabus.* Now, a mina was a pound weight of silver, and consequently equivalent to three pounds sterling. And I'll crave leave to ask Mr. B. what sense there is in his or their version? *Pray what does your gown stand you in?* Answer, *It's a very dear gown, it costs me above* THREE *or* SIX *pounds.* Pray, who ever talked at this rate? What, is there no medium between *three* and *six* pounds? If I should ask a friend what he rents his house at, and he should tell me, at above forty or fourscore pounds a-year, it might pass perhaps for a banter, but an answer I should not take it for. And yet the woman in Theocritus is

very serious, and does not seem to have been of those *that take ridicule and grimace for the most diverting thing in the world.* If Theocritus had really writ at this rate, I perceive it would pass upon Mr. B.; but I'm afraid that king Ptolemy, a good judge of wit, whom Theocritus presented this poem to, would have paid him for't in *Sicilian drachms.* But the fault is not the poet's, but theirs that translate him; and the true reading is *MNAN*, the genitive Doric for *μνῶν*; and the construction is, *πλέον ἢ δύο μνᾶν ἀργυρίω καθαρῶ, it cost me above six fair pounds.*

There's another fault too in the second passage that the Examiner cites;

Ἑπτὰ δραχμῶν κυνάδας, γραῖαν ἀποτίλματα πηρῶν·

for in the old editions of Aldus and others 'tis

Ἑπταδράχμως κυνάδας——

which, because it was not understood, was changed by the later editors. But the ancient reading is the true, if we take it, as it ought to be taken, *ἑπταδράχμως*, the accusative Doric for *ἑπταδράχμους*, from the adjective *ἑπτάδραχμος*.* The sense indeed will be the same still, but the composition will be more elegant. Mr. B. may say, and he has good reason, that the not correcting these passages cannot be imputed as a fault to him, when such great men as Stephanus, Casaubon, Heinsius, &c. failed as well as he. We'll allow this, therefore, and not lay these omissions to his charge; but then he ought not to abuse and calumniate others, who have honest endeavours to *improve* this part of learning, if envy will let them be quiet.

The other authors that Mr. B. has produced to shew that talents, minæ, and drachms, of an equal value with those of Greece, were current in Sicily, are Thucydides, Plato, Polybius, Diodorus, and Plutarch; but not one of them was a Sicilian, except Diodorus, and he too wrote his History in a foreign country, and uses the common dialect,

[* See note p. 43.—D.]

and comes CCCCC. years after Phalaris. Now, to answer all these instances at once, for the thing is too vulgar to be insisted on particularly; I must acquaint him with what every body else knows, but to him is a secret, that all the authors that write in the Attic or common dialect do of course turn the sums of money of any country that they speak of into the Attic account; not meaning that the Attic coins were used in specie upon these occasions, but that the money, of whatever sort it was, was equivalent in weight or value to so much Attic money. And the end that they had in so doing is conspicuous enough; for, designing their histories for general use, they thought the best way to be understood by all, was to reduce the money to some species universally known. And if Mr. B. had ever compared the Greek and Latin writers of the Roman history together, he must necessarily have observed it. I'll give him one or two examples of it, which may serve instead of all. Livy,[z] who, as a Roman, writes in the style of his own country, tells us Servius Tullius divided the Roman citizens into five classes; the first was of such as were rated at *centum millia æris*, that is, 100,000 *asses, or brass money;* the second at 75,000; and so on to the lowest. But Dionysius Halicarnassensis,[a] who wrote for the Greeks, turns these accounts into Attic silver, and makes the first class to be rated *ἑκατὸν μνῶν, ἢ μυρίων δραχμῶν, at a* 100 *minæ, or* 10,000 *drachms:* and the second, *πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα μνῶν, ἢ ἑπτακισχιλίων καὶ πεντακοσίων δραχμῶν, at* 75 *minæ, or* 7500 *drachms:* and so to the fifth. Now, this account of the Greek historian cannot be true, if we understand those drachms to have been used in specie; for it's known that the Romans had no silver money till CCC. years after the time of this Servius. But Livy and he agree in the value, though not in the species; for X. *asses* of brass being equivalent to one Attic *drachm* of silver, 100,000 of such *asses* are worth 10,000 *drachms,* and 75,000 *asses* worth 7500

[z] Livy, lib. i.

[a] Dionys. Halic. p. 22.

drachms. The same Livy informs us, that Camillus was threatened to be fined *quingentum millium æris mulcta,* 500,000 *asses of brass;* which Plutarch[b] represents in silver money, and calls it πέντε μυριάδων ἀργυρίου ζημίωσιν, *a fine of* 50,000 *drachms.* And yet the Romans had no use of silver coin till a hundred years after Camillus. If Plutarch, therefore, in his account of Camillus, has turned the Roman money to Attic, why may he not have turned the Sicilian so, in his history of Timoleon? And if he did it, why not Polybius too? and why not Plato and Thucydides much rather, being natives of Athens? Diodorus, it's true, was a Sicilian; but as he forsook the dialect of Sicily, so, in consequence, he ought to depart from it in the names and *species* of its money, and not fill his History with νοῦμμοι, and οὐγκίαι, and ἑξᾶντες, and πεντούγκια, words that nobody would understand abroad but grammarians and antiquaries. Besides that, as I observed before, he is so many centuries junior to Phalaris, that the money of that island might possibly be altered to the Greek species in all that tract of time. But that the old names of money continued there till the time of Gelon tyrant of Syracuse, LXX. years after Phalaris's death, Diodorus himself will teach us. For he says that, upon the defeat of the Carthaginians, Damareta, the wife of Gelon, coined a new piece of money, *of the value of ten Attic drachms; but the Sicilians called it from its weight* πεντηκοντάλιτρον.[c] This passage even alone will shew that there was no such money nor name as *drachm* in those days in Sicily. For if there had, they would have called this money δεκάδραχμον, from *the value of ten drachms;* and not πεντηκοντάλιτρον, from *the weight of fifty litræ.* From which compound word it plainly appears, that the *litra,* one of those Sicilian coins that I and my authors contend for, was yet in use in the time of Gelon. Without question, therefore, it was used there in Phalaris's time;

[b] Plut. in Camillo.

[c] Diodor. Sic. p. 21. Εἶχεν Ἀττικὰς δραχμὰς δέκα· ἐκλήθη δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Σικελιώταις ἀπὸ τοῦ σταθμοῦ πεντηκοντάλιτρον.

and if you admit of the *litra* for a Sicilian coin, you must take all the rest after it, that are mentioned by Aristotle and Pollux; as the δεκάλιτρον, the ἡμιλίτριον, &c.; for these plainly refer to and suppose one another, as a half-crown English supposes a crown. And what has the Examiner got now by his *approved Sicilian writers?* To what purpose are his ridiculous computations; *a talent,* 1*s.* 10*d.*½ *for a month's pay of a ship;* 200 *minæ,* 6*s.* 3*d. for the magnificent funeral of a general?* (p. 87, 88.) I know not what they can stand for there, but to be emblems of his own performance, which, at first view, and to unskilful readers, seems a business of great value and price, as the Greek talents and minæ were; but when examined more narrowly, it dwindles into *talents of eighteen pence, and minæ of three farthings.*

But see what it is to be engaged with such a master of defence: *he may freely admit,* he says, *of the low value of the Sicilian talent, and yet think the* Letters *genuine. For there are several suppositions that must all be shewn impossible, before any convincing argument can be drawn from hence to prove them spurious* (p. 88, 89). To prove suppositions to be *impossible,* is a very hard task indeed; and if nothing less than that will serve, 'tis more difficult to *convince* Mr. B. than to convert a Jew. But let us see what his *suppositions* are: I. *There might be a low value of the Sicilian talent in some other age, and yet the talent of Phalaris's time might be higher* (p. 89). But I'll presently shew him that in Epicharmus's and Sophron's time, the very next generation to Phalaris, the Sicilian money was as I have stated it: and Aristotle[d] says, that τὸ ἀρχαῖον, *in* OLD *time,* the talent there was but XXIV. νοῦμμοι, about VII*s.* Engl. II. *Or a low talent might be in other parts of Sicily, but a higher at Agrigentum.* But Aristotle[e] tells us in general, Σικελικὸν τάλαντον, the SICILIAN talent was XXIV. νοῦμμοι; which must include Agrigentum, unless Mr. B. will carry that too into Crete, as he did Astypalæa. Nay, the

[d] Poll. p. 437. [=1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.] [e] Ibid.

philosopher expressly says,[f] that the λίτρα was AGRIGENTINE money: and if the litra come in there, the talent and all the rest will follow it. III. *Or there might be a low talent of baser metal, suppose brass, equal to a litra; and yet Phalaris's silver talents might be higher.* Here are so many blunders in this supposition, that I scarce know which to begin with. He believes a talent in Sicily was a single piece of money, or a coin; but it was a sum, as a pound is in England. And upon this he fancies a brass talent was less than a silver one; which is just as if he should say that a pound paid in copper farthings is less than a pound paid in sixpences. But from whence could he have that extravagant stuff, *a brass talent equal to a litra?* I am afraid again that he was *not awake* here; but methinks he might have got out of his nap in his second or third edition. A brass litra of Sicily weighed a pound, and LX. of them made a talent. And a small coin of silver, of equal value to a litra of brass, had from thence the name too of litra, (as among the Romans the silver coin was called *denarius*, because it was valued at X. *asses* of brass,) and LX. of those silver *litræ* made the ancient talent of silver. So that a talent of silver and a talent of brass were both equal in value, and both contained LX. litræ. But Mr. B. has a marginal note here, *that the talents in Pollux are compared to χαλκοῖ, and are lower in value than they.* Admirably observed indeed! This same margin of his has in several places quite outdone the text. The text here says, *a talent of brass was equal to a litra;* but the margin tells us, *it was less than a χαλκοῦς,* which was but the XIIth part of a litra. So that both text and margin together form a proposition exactly like this: *A certain book of a late writer's is worth four shillings, and too dear of three pence.* But the shameful mistake of this marginal note is founded upon a corrupt reading in Pollux, ἓξ τάλαντα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοῖ, that is, *six talents, which*

[f] Pollux, p. 216, 436. [=454, 1057. *ed. Hemst.* — D.] Ἐν Ἀκραγαντίνων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν Ἀριστοτέλης ζημιοῦσθαί τινα λ' λίτρας.

is two brass pieces: which I have already observed, and shall presently prove, is to be corrected *ἑξᾶντα*. And I dare appeal to any English reader, though he understands not one word of Greek, if the passage, as I have faithfully translated it, does not betray itself to be corrupted. For the author, being to make a general comparison of money, would have expressed it, as all the world uses to do, in the lowest numbers of proportion, and would certainly have said, *three talents make one brass piece;* not *six make two.* And yet Mr. B., with all his acuteness, could argue from this reading, as if it were genuine. IV. *Or there might be a low value* (*talent*, I suppose he would say) *used by the natives and ancient inhabitants of Sicily; and yet the talent used by the Greek colonies, that placed themselves there, might be higher.* But the very names of the money we speak of shew they belonged not to the Sicanians or Phœnicians in Sicily, but to the colonies of Greeks; as *οὐγκία* from *ὄγκος*, *νοῦμμος* from *νόμος*, *τετρᾶς*, *τριᾶς*, *ἑξᾶς*, *ἡμιλίτριον*, *δεκάλιτρον*: these are certainly Greek words, and neither Phœnician nor barbarous Sicanian. And Diodorus says the *Σικελιῶται*, Sicilian Greeks (not the ancient inhabitants of the island) called the money of Gelon's time *πεντηκοντάλιτρον*. Pollux also and Aristotle say expressly they were the monies *τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ Δωρίεων*, *of the Dorian colonies in Sicily;* and that *νοῦμμος* was a coin of the Tarentines in Italy, who were a Dorian colony too, and had no concern with the old Sicanians. V. *Or, if these* Letters *might by a later hand be changed out of the Doric dialect into the Attic, the same hand might make them speak Attic in the valuation of the monies.* This is his last supposition, and the pleasantest of them all: and though I doubt not but the very proposal of it will be received with laughter by all competent readers, yet I'll give him an answer to it, when I consider the general way of his defence. We have now got, and I hope safely, over all his suppositions: and though I will not pretend to have shewn them *impossible*, yet I have shewn them so groundless and absurd, that a wise man will be ashamed of them. But to

prove any thing of this nature *impossible* is truly an impossible thing. For how can we bring demonstrations about matters of mere history? If nothing, therefore, but downright *impossibility* will *convince* the Examiner that his Phalaris is spurious, he may still, *to his comfort*, believe them genuine. But at that rate he's well prepared to believe all the stories of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, or Apuleius's *Ass*.

But our misfortune is, that, though we have stood the shock of so many *suppositions*, yet we are just where we were before. For, *lastly*, he says, *though none of his reasonings should hold, 'tis agreed by those who treat of these matters, and give us this low value of the Sicilian talent, that wherever the word talent is used by Greek writers* (as it is in Phalaris's *Epistles*) *without any addition, the Attic talent must be understood* (p. 89). And for this he quotes Gronovius, Bernard, and Brerewood. Now, allowing this to be true, what would our sagacious critic infer from't? Do not I myself affirm too, that in Phalaris's *Epistles* the Attic talent is understood? The very circumstances of every passage there where talent is mentioned shew he meant the Attic; and 'tis the sole ground and foundation of all this article against him. Mr. B. therefore may assure himself that I shall never make Phalaris's *Epistles* an exception to that rule of Gronovius. That the Attic is meant in the *Epistles* will be allowed on all sides; but whether the true Phalaris would have used the word so, there is the question. And do Mr. B.'s marginal citations prove any thing of that? Diodorus, though a Sicilian, had good reasons for his reckoning by Attic money; because he wrote in the common dialect, because the Attic valuation was then universally known, because other historians had done so before him. But must Phalaris therefore be supposed to have used the Attic accounts, at a time when the Attic talent was no better known than the Sicilian? Must he do it in private letters, that were never intended for the public? in stating the expenses of his household, which, being laid out in Sicilian money, could not be expressed in Attic without puzzling

fractions? If Mr. B. will obstinately maintain such absurdities as these, he'll fully satisfy his readers, that, whatever there was in Phalaris's *accounts*, in Mr. B.'s genius there's nothing of Attic.

Mr. B. declares, *that he finds the moderns go into the opinion of a Sicilian talent of low value, without any other authority, as he can find, but the obscure and interpolated passages of Pollux and Festus* (p. 88.): *but the notion ought to be supported by good authorities, taken from approved Sicilian writers, or others that purposely treat of Sicilian affairs* (p. 84). I will give him an account, therefore, of the authorities we go upon; and I believe it will presently appear that the *approved Sicilian writers*, such as Epicharmus and Sophron, who were nearest the age of Phalaris, and *those that purposely treat of Sicilian affairs*, such as Aristotle in his account of the Sicilian Governments, do all countenance and support the notion, that the Sicilian money was different from the Attic both in species and name. But, for the clearer illustration of what I shall say here, I will give a table of the Sicilian coins, according to those authors, and compare them with the Roman coins, which were all borrowed from them.

A TABLE OF THE SICILIAN MONEY.

METAL.	SICILIAN.	ROMAN.	VALUE.
Brass or silver.	Τάλαντον.		60 brass or silver litræ.
Silver.	Πεντηκοντάλιτρον.		50 litræ.
Silver.	Δεκάλιτρον.	*Denarius.*	10 litræ.
Silver.	Νοῦμμος.	*Nummus, Sestertius.*	2½ litræ.
Brass or silver.	Λίτρα.	*Libra, As, Libella.*	A pound weight of brass, or a piece of silver equivalent.
Brass, silver.	Ἡμιλίτριον.	*Semissis, Sembella.*	Half a litra.
Brass.	Πεντούγκιον.	*Quincunx.*	5 ounces of brass.
Brass.	Τριᾶς.	*Triens.*	A third part of a litra.
Brass.	Τετρᾶς.	*Quadrans, Teruncius.*	A fourth of a litra.
Brass.	Ἑξᾶς.	*Sextans.*	A sixth of a litra.
Brass.	Οὐγκία.	*Uncia.*	1 ounce of brass.

This table comprehends all the names of the Sicilian sums or coins, from the highest down to the lowest: and I shall now subjoin the passages of authors which establish and warrant every one of them.

ΤΑΛΑΝΤΟΝ.

The Sicilian TALENT, says Pollux,[g] *had the lowest value of all. Of old, as Aristotle teaches, it contained* XXIV. *νοῦμμοι, but afterwards only* XII. Now, a *νοῦμμος, nummus,* as I shall shew presently, was the IVth part of a denare; so

[g] Pollux, p. 431. [=1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

that the ancient talent contained VI. denares, and the latter III. And Suidas falls in exactly with Aristotle's account; for he informs us, *that among the Sicilian Greeks a talent was anciently* XXIV. *nummi, but now* XII.[h] In the vulgar editions 'tis *μνῶν*; but the true reading is *νούμμων*, as the passage of Aristotle clearly shews; and so it's corrected by Budæus, and every body since that have treated of these matters. The word *νούμμων* being not understood by the copier, was corrupted into *μνῶν*. To these authorities we may add Festus, who, giving the value of several sorts of talents, says, *the Neapolitan contains* VI. *denares, the Syracusan* III., *and that of Rhegium half a denare.*[i] What Festus here calls the Neapolitan talent has the same value with the old talent of Sicily; which is not to be wondered at, since Aristotle and Pollux affirm that the *νοῦμμος*, one of the coins of Sicily, was common to the Tarentine and other Dorian colonies of Italy. And the Syracusan talent of Festus is the very same with what Aristotle and Suidas call the *later Sicilian.* Here are four authorities, then, Aristotle, Pollux, Suidas, and Festus, for the low valuation of the Sicilian talent. And the alteration that Mr. B. and some others would introduce into the text of Festus now appears to be groundless. They would interpolate it thus, *Syracusanum trium* (*millium*) *denarium, the Syracusan talent had* 3000 *denares.* But what authority have they for this talent of 3000? None at all. Is it not a glorious correction, then, and worthy to be embraced by Mr. B., to change the reading that's warranted by three authors, and to substitute another that's supported by none? And what will they do with the following words, *Rheginum victoriati?* Will they insert *millium* there too, and make it neither Latin nor sense? But if the talent of Rhegium was but equivalent to five pounds of brass, why must that of Sicily be thought too low when it's made equal to thirty or sixty?

[h] Suid. in Τάλαντον.

[i] Festus. Tal. Neapolitanum sex denarium. Syracusanum trium denarium. Rheginum victoriati.

'Tis very certain that the Romans called the common Attic talent *talentum magnum, the great talent;* an expression never used by any Greek author: so that the reason and ground of it has been a great inquiry among the antiquaries of the last age. But the ingenious and learned Gronovius[j] has lit upon a conjecture that has all the characters of truth and certainty. The Romans had no such sum nor name as *talent* in their way of accounts; but, by their dealings with the neighbouring Greeks, the Sicilians, Rhegians, Tarentines, Neapolitans, they knew a talent among them stood for a small sum of silver. Afterwards, when they extended their commerce or their conquests to other parts of Greece, they found a talent there meant a vast sum of 6000 denares, which was 1000, or 2000, or 12000 times as much as the talents of their neighbours. This latter, therefore, was called the *great talent,* and in process of time *talent* alone, the other acceptation of the word falling into disuse. I do not question but all competent judges will receive this notion of Gronovius with approbation and applause. And as the expression *talentum magnum* is so fairly explained by the low Sicilian talent, so, reciprocally, the low value of that talent is plainly made out by the expression *talentum magnum.**

[j] Gronov. de Pecun. Vet. iii. 3.

[* Gronovius was under a mistake in supposing the Romans had no such sum as a talent in their accounts; as Mr. Clarke has clearly shewn, in his Connexion of Roman, Saxon, and English Coins, p. 395. n. *t.* Every talent bore the very *same* proportion to that pound which was the basis of the computation, *i. e.* all were sixty pounds of *their own* weight. A *nummulary* talent, from a pound of XII. ounces, was five times XII., or sixty pounds. By the same rule, the *commercial* retail talent, from a pound of XVI. ounces, was five times XVI., or eighty pounds. That this was the *talentum magnum,* is evident from Plautus, Mostell. act III. sc. i. 102, 114. Tranio endeavours to persuade his master to engage for a debt which his son had indiscreetly contracted, and for which the creditor was then making very pressing demands. "Quater quadraginta illi "debentur *minæ.* Dic te illi daturum, ut abeat." This sum is afterwards computed in great talents, "—eas quanti destinat?

"TR. *Talentis magnis* totidem, quot ego et tu sumus."

Here two talents are four times forty, or twice eighty pounds, viz. from a pound

But there's one thing not yet accounted for; how it came about, that in those Dorian colonies the word *talent* was applied to such inconsiderable sums. I will crave leave to propose a conjecture of mine, and submit it to the censures of the learned. *Talent*[k] originally is a word of static, and means LX. pound weight of any thing. Now the brass λίτρα of Sicily being at first a pound weight, as the *libra* or *as* was among the Romans, LX. such *litræ* weighed in all LX. pounds, and consequently were called a *talent*. Afterwards, when silver money came into use among them, the species of it had their denominations from the proportions they bore to the brass *litra*. So that a small silver coin, equivalent in worth to a brass pound, was called λίτρα; and another coin, containing ten of them, δεκάλιτρον: just as the Romans called their silver coin *denarius*, because it was equal in value to *deni asses*, ten brass pounds. By the same rule, therefore, a sum of silver containing LX. silver *litræ*, or VI. (δεκάλιτρα) denares, was called a *talent*, because it was equivalent to LX. pound weight of brass. Here I conceive is a probable account how the *old* Sicilian talent came to stand for VI. denares, or, as Aristotle expresses it, XXIV. *nummi*. But the same author acquaints us, that afterwards the talent sunk lower, to the value of XII. *nummi*, or III. *denares*. The occasion of which seems to have been this. As Solon diminished the Attic drachm a fourth part in weight, making

of XVI. ounces. Priscian confirms this evidence: "Talentum *parvum* Athe-"niense minæ sexaginta; *magnum* octoginta et tres libræ, et quatuor unciæ." Gram. Vet. vol. i. p. 134. Priscian was in this instance making a nice calculation how many Roman pounds were equal to this great talent. The Attic pound, by the account of these later writers, was a 24th part larger than the Roman. Divide 80 by 24, you have 3 and $\frac{1}{3}$ for the quotient, or *octoginta tres libræ et quatuor unciæ*, in round numbers eighty pounds. The very character of the persons in Plautus destroys Gronovius' reasonings on this subject. The scene is Athens, the dramatis personæ Greeks, well acquainted with their own nummulary talent, before they ever heard of those diminutive computations. And therefore when the Athenians spake of the *talentum magnum*, it was to distinguish either the *commercial* talent, or the Asiatic *nummulary* talent, from *their own* of sixty pounds. *Note on ed.* 1777.—D.]

[k] Suidas, Pollux, and others.

100 of them go to a pound, which LXXV. made before; and as the Romans, being straitened in the first Punic war, lowered their brass money five parts in six, making their *as*, which till then was a full pound weight, to be no more than two ounces, so the Sicilians seem to have lessened their brass money half in half; and yet the old names (as among the Romans) continued still, notwithstanding the change in weight. A talent of brass, therefore, containing LX. of those half-pound litræ, was no more than III. denares, or XII. nummi of silver. But the Rhegians, according to Festus, seem to have sunk their brass litræ from a pound weight to an ounce; which is exactly what the Romans did in the second Punic war, when they made their *as* to be *uncialis*, of a single ounce weight. By which proportion, though the talent even among the Rhegians might at first be LX. litræ, each of which weighed a pound, yet after they were diminished to an ounce a-piece, a talent of LX. such litræ would be worth no more than half a denare, or the *victoriatus* of Festus.

ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΝΤΑΛΙΤΡΟΝ.

We have an account of this coin from Diodorus Siculus;[1] that, after Gelon had vanquished the Carthaginians in Sicily, Ol. LXXV. I., Demareta his wife interceded in their behalf, and obtained for them an honourable peace; and upon that occasion she caused a new coin to be stamped, weighing L. litræ, that is, five *δεκάλιτρα*, denares, or, as Diodorus computes it, X. Attic drachms. This money was called *Δημαρέτιον*, from her name, and by the Sicilians *πεντηκοντάλιτρον*, from the weight and value of it. The same money is mentioned by Pollux,[m] but he tells us quite another story about the occasion of coining it; *that, when her husband wanted money in the war against the Carthaginians, Demareta and the rest of the women brought all their silver utensils to the mint, and the coin was called νόμισμα Δημαρέτιον.* But the very bigness of the money, being five times the weight

[1] Diodor. p. 21.

[m] Pollux, p. 437. [=1067. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

of their heaviest ordinary coin, shews Diodorus's narrative to be truer than Pollux's; for if Gelon had been in any straits for money, he would certainly have stamped it in the smallest species; whereas this was a sort of medal, and by its magnitude declared the greatness of the victory and the booty. This Demareta was the daughter of Theron tyrant of Agrigentum, and after Gelon's decease was married to Polyzelus his brother, as we learn from the Scholiast of Pindar;[n] who adds too, that from her a Sicilian coin was called *Δημαρέτειον*. Diodorus acquaints us farther,[o] that Gelon out of part of the booty made a golden tripus of XVI. talents, and sent it to Delphi a donary to Apollo. And there's an epigram of Simonides upon the same tripus, which I suppose is not yet published, and therefore I shall give it here out of the MS. *Anthologia;*

Σιμωνίδου.

Φημὶ Γέλων', Ἱέρωνα, Πολύζηλον, Θρασύβουλον,
Παῖδας Δεινομένευς τὸν τρίποδ' ἀνθέμεναι,
Ἐξ ἑκατὸν λιτρῶν καὶ πεντήκοντα ταλάντων
Δαρετίου χρυσοῦ τᾶς δεκάτας δεκάταν.

Where it's observable, that Simonides, who perhaps was then in Sicily, and saw the tripus, says it weighed above L. talents; but Diodorus says XVI. If we believe the Scholiast of Pindar,[p] 'twas not one tripus only, but several, that Gelon dedicated to Apollo, and this inscription was engraved on them;

Φημὶ Γέλων', Ἱέρωνα, Πολύζηλον, Θρασύβουλον,
Παῖδας Δεινομένευς τοὺς τρίποδας θέμεναι,
Βάρβαρα νικήσαντας ἔθνη, πολλὴν δὲ παρασχεῖν
Σύμμαχον Ἕλλησιν χεῖρ' ἐς ἐλευθερίην.

Which appears to be the very same epigram with that

[n] Schol. Pind. Olymp. ii. Ἀφ' ἧς καὶ τὸ Δημαρέτειον νόμισμα ἐν Σικελίᾳ.
[o] Diod. ibid.
[p] Schol. Pind. Pyth. i. Ἀναθεῖναι τῷ θεῷ χρυσοῦς τρίποδας ἐπιγράψαντα ταῦτα.

ascribed to Simonides; and the one perhaps is to be supplied out of the other, the latter distich of this being to be added to that. But what can be the meaning of *Δαρετίου χρυσοῦ*? If we consider the passages already cited out of Diodorus, Pollux, and Pindar's Scholiast, which all belong to the subject of this epigram, we can scarce doubt but the true reading is,

*Δαμαρετίου χρυσοῦ τᾶς δεκάτας δεκάταν·**

where the poet was constrained of mere necessity to use a pæon instead of a dactyl, as another poet did without any necessity;

Ἀλλὰ τεὸν οὔποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔπειθε.†

But the copiers, not considering this, and observing the verse to have a syllable too much, contracted the word into *Δαρετίου*; which has been done above DCC. years ago, as it's evident from Suidas: *Δαρετίου*, says he,[q] *τὸν τρίποδα δ' ἀνθέμεναι ἐξ ἑκατὸν λιτρῶν καὶ πεντήκοντα ταλάντων Δαρετίου χρυσοῦ τᾶς δεκάτας*; where the word, we see, is set down, but there's no explication of it. He has only given part of our epigram, where he found that *Δαρετίου*: and as that word both in Suidas and the epigram is to be corrected from other authors, so the rest of that passage of Suidas is to be corrected from the epigram.

ΔΕΚΑΛΙΤΡΟΝ. ΛΙΤΡΑ. ΗΜΙΛΙΤΡΙΟΝ.

Aristotle, in his treatise of the *Agrigentine Government*, informs us, *that a person was fined there* (*τριάκοντα λίτρας*)

[* Toup, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) II. 509., reads *Δαρετίου*, and adds: " Idem *Δαμαρετίου*, *Δαμρετίου*, et *Δαρετίου*. Ut *Ὁμόθροον*, *ὅμθροον*, et *ὅθροον*. " *Ὁμόζυγες*, *ὅμζυγες*, et *ὄζυγες*. *Ὁμότριχες*, *ὅμτριχες*, et *ὄτριχες*. Nimirum *τὸ* " *μ'* euphoniæ gratiâ non rarò omittitur."—See this epigram in *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed Jacobs.*) I. 66., *Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 253., and *Poet. Min. Gr.* (*ed. Gaisford.*) I. 373., where the common lection, *Δαρετίου*, is given.—D.]

[† Praxilla in Hephæst. *Enchir.* p. 22. *ed. Gaisf.*, where . . . . *ἔπειθον*.—D.]

[q] Suid. v. *Δαρετίου*.

xxx. *litræ; and that a litra was equal in value to an Æginæan obolus.* The same he repeats in his discourse about the *Himeræan Government, that the litra was equal to an obolus, and the* δεκάλιτρον *contained* x. *litræ, and was worth a Corinthian stater.*[r] These particulars are told us twice by Pollux, in his ivth and ixth book, so that there's no room for any suspicion that he mistook his author. *Λίτρα,* says Hesychius, *ὀβολὸς, οἱ δὲ νόμισμα παρὰ Σικελοῖς· οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ σταθμῶν· οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι διὰ τὸ β' λίβρα.* Photius in his MS. Lexicon, *Λίτρα ἦν μὲν νόμισμά τι, ὡς Δίφιλος· ἐπί* τε σταθμοῦ Ἐπίχαρμός τε καὶ Σώφρων ἐχρήσαντο· Σοφοκλῆς δὲ λιτρόσκοπόν φησι τὸν ἀργυραμοιβὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ νομίσματος.* Hesychius again, *Λιτροσκόπους, ἀργυραμοιβοὺς, ἀπὸ τοῦ Σικελικοῦ νομίσματος, ὃ καλεῖται λίτρα.* Here are two good authors concurring with Pollux, besides the three others that one of them cites, Diphilus, Epicharmus, and Sophron; but we have not the names of them only, but the very passages too preserved to us in Pollux. *The comic poets,* says he,[s] *of Sicily use the word* λίτρα *sometimes for a small piece of money; as when Sophron says, in his book called* Γυναικεῖοι Μῖμοι, Ὁ μισθὸς δεκάλιτρον (the true reading here seems to be δέκα λιτρῶν or λιτρᾶν), *and again in his* Ἀνδρεῖοι Μῖμοι, Σῶσαι δ' οὐδὲ τὰς δύο λίτρας δύναμαι; *and sometimes for a pound weight, as Demologus in his* Medea,

Τετρακονταλίτρους τινὶ νεανίσκῳ πέδας.

In the vulgar editions it's παῖδας; which Salmasius[t] has truly corrected πέδας, *chains of* xl. *pound weight.* But there's another error still remaining; Δημόλογος, a poet as unheard of as Phalaris's two tragedians Aristolochus and Lysinus: instead of which Demologus, the MS. of Is. Vos-

[r] Pollux, p. 216, 436. [=454, 1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[* ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ στ. κ. τ. λ. *ed. Pors.*—D.]

[s] Pollux, p. 215. [=454. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[t] Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 234.

sius has it *Δεινόλοχος*, which is certainly the true reading. For this Dinolochus was really a Sicilian comic poet (as Pollux here supposes him), *being a Syracusan, or an Agrigentine, and the son, or, as others say, the scholar of Epicharmus, and the author of* XII. *Doric comedies.*[u] He is cited again by Pollux,[v] *Δεινόλοχος ἐν Ἁμαζόσιν*; and twice or thrice by Hesychius. But our author proceeds, and tells us,[w] *that even some of the Athenian comics mention the word λίτρα, as Philemon in his play inscribed Σικελικὸς, and Posidippus in his Γαλάτεια.* In the editions 'tis printed *Γαλάτη*, which learned men have corrected *Γαλάτεια*: and the great Salmasius acutely observes, that it appears by the names of these two comedies, that the scene and subject of them were in Sicily; so that the poets there used the word *λίτρα* not as Attic money, but as Sicilian. In another place,[x] our author ascribes the play not to Philemon, but to Diphilus, as Photius also seems to have done in the passage above cited; but Athenæus gives it to Philemon;[y] so that it was dubious, even in those days, whether of them was the author of it. The words of Diphilus are these;

Οἷον ἀγοράζειν παστὰ, μηδὲ ἓν δ' ἔχειν,
*Εἰ μὴ κικίννους ἀξίους λίτραιν δυοῖν.**

In the Vossian MS. it's *πάντα* for *παστὰ*, which may seem the truer lection, because of the elegant opposition there between *πάντα* and *μηδὲ ἕν*. But *παστὰ* too is a very tolerable lection, being a dish made of cheese and other ingredients; and the cheese of Sicily, where the action of this play lies, was famous, as the poet tells us in this very comedy.[z] *But Epicharmus,* continues Pollux,[a] *mentions several names of money in his play called Ἁρπαγαί.* The

[u] Suid. v. Δεινολ. [v] Pollux, p. 500. [=1368. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]
[w] Id. p. 217. [=455. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]
[x] Pollux, p. 436. [=1058. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]
[y] Athen. p. 658. [=V. 395. *ed. Schw.*—D.]
[* Pollux, p. 1058. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]
[z] Athen. ibid. [a] Pollux, 436. [=p. 1059. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

passage there is thus represented in the Vossian MS., *Ὥσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες, αἵθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς ἀμπετάκιον ἀργύριον, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραν· αἱ δ' ἂν ἡμίλιτρον δεχόμεναι, καὶ πάντα γιγνώσκοντι.* And I guess, from the emendation of Salmasius,[b] that the Palatine MS. had it exactly so too, and perhaps the MS. of Vossius is nothing but a copy of it. Salmasius has thus reduced the words into trochaic verses;

——*Ὥσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες,*
Αἵθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς, αἱ πεττούγκιον
Ἀργυρίου, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραν, αἱ δ' ἡμίλιτρον δεχόμεναι
Πάντα γιγνώσκοντι——

Where in the third verse the true measure is not observed, a spondee being put there instead of a trochee: but as for *μωρὰς* in the second verse, the Dorians frequently made the accusative *ας* short, as we see in Theocritus. I would read the whole in this manner;

——*Ὥσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες,*
Αἵθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς, ἂμ πεντούγκιον
Ἀργυρέον, ἄλλαι δὲ λίτραν, αἱ δ' ἂν ἡμιλίτριον
*Δεχόμεναι, καὶ πάντα γιγνώσκοντι τῷ τηνᾶν λόγῳ.**

The three last words do not appear in the MS.; but the vulgar editions have *τῷ τι λόγῳ*, which must be lengthened by a syllable to close up the trochaic. The meaning of the

[b] Salmas. p. 261. [De Modo Usur.—D.]

[* " — *καὶ πάντα γιγνώσκοντι* ΚΩΤΙΛΩι ΛΟΓΩι . . . . . nostra emendatio " verissima et elegantissima est. Vox *κωτίλος* usitata est de *muliebri garrulitate* " et *sermone fraudulento.*" Toup, *Emend. in Suid.* II. 312. In support of his emendation, Toup cites Hesiod. *Op.* 373.; Theocrit. in *Syracus.* 64, 87, 89.; and Suidas v. Κωτίλη.

In Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, II. 1040. the passage is given thus;

ὥσπερ αἱ πονηραὶ μάντιες,
αἵθ' ὑπονέμονται γυναῖκας μωρὰς, αἱ μὲν οὐγκίαν
ἀργυρίου, ταὶ δ' ἡμίλιτρον, ταὶ δὲ λίτραν δεχόμεναι,
καὶ τὰ πάντα γινώσκοντι. D.]

passage is this; *Like those roguish fortune-tellers, that wheedle foolish women, some of them exacting a five-ounce piece of money, some a litra, some half a litra; and, as those silly women believe, they know all things.* Ἀμ in the second verse is for ἀν; for in ancient writing, when the *N* came before *M* or *B* or *Π* or *Φ*, it was changed into *M*; as in the *Chron. Arundelianum*, *ΕΜ ΠΑΡΩΙ* for ἐν Πάρῳ; and in the Marble of Smyrna, *ΕΜ ΜΑΓΝΗΣΙΑΙ* for ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ: and the modern Greeks, though they write it *N* in those cases, yet they pronounce it as *M*. In the third verse I read ἡμιλίτριον instead of ἡμίλιτρον; for I observe that's the form of the compounds with ημι, as ἡμιαμφόριον, ἡμιθωράκιον, ἡμιδιπλοΐδιον, ἡμισφαίριον, ἡμιπόδιον, and many more. Another passage from Epicharmus is thus cited by the same Pollux,[c] Ἐγὼ γὰρ τὸ βαλάντιον λιτροδεκάλιτρον ἑξάγγιόν τε καὶ πεντάγγιον; which is thus exhibited in the Vossian MS.,* Ἐγὼ γὰρ τόγε βαλάντιον λιτροδεκάλιτρος στατὴρ ἑξάντιόν τε πετάγκιον. And so in all probability the Palatine MS. reads it; as one may gather from Salmasius,[d] who thus corrects it by the help of it;

——Ἐφ' ᾧ γὰρ τὸ βαλάντιον, λίτρα,
Δεκάλιτρος στατὴρ, ἑξάντιόν τε καὶ πεττούγκιον.

But by this emendation both the verses have false measure, neither does the sense appear very elegant. It seems to me very probable that στατὴρ in the MSS. is an interpolation; because in other places Pollux tells us that the δεκάλιτρον was worth a Corinthian στατὴρ, from whence the interpolater borrowed it, and clapt it in here. But it cannot be Epicharmus's own, for two reasons, both because it is no Sicilian word, and because it makes a tautology. If I may have leave to propose an emendation, I would read the passage thus;

[c] Pollux, ibid. [p. 1059. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[* But see the reading of the MS. as given in the notes on *Pollux*, p. 1059. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[d] Salmas. p. 260. [De Modo Usur.—D.]

——Ἔχω γὰρ τόγε βαλάντιον λιτρᾶν
Δεκαλιτρῶν τε πλῆρες, ἑξάντων τε, καὶ πεντουγκίων.

I have my purse, says he, *full of litræ, and denares, and two-ounce pieces, and five-ounce pieces.*

ΝΟΥΜΜΟΣ.

Julius Pollux, who wrote his book at Rome, and dedicated it to the Emperor Commodus, tells him, *that the word* νοῦμμος *appears indeed to be of Roman original, but it's really Greek, belonging to the Dorians of Sicily and Italy.*[e] So Varro also expressly teaches, *that the word* nummus *was borrowed from the Sicilians: In argento, nummi: id à Siculis.*[f] The same Pollux adds, *that Aristotle, in his treatise of the Tarentine Government, says, a certain coin there was called* νοῦμμος, *which for its impress had Taras the son of Neptune astride upon a dolphin.* Half a score of these Tarentine νοῦμμοι, with that stamp upon them, are in Goltzius. Again, our author acquaints us, *that according to Aristotle, the old talent of Sicily contained* XXIV. νοῦμμοι, *but the later* XII. *only; and that a* νοῦμμος *was equivalent to an obolus and a half.** And then he confirms the authority of the word νοῦμμος by two passages of Epicharmus;† the first of them, Κῆρυξ ἰὼν εὐθὺς πριῶ μοι δέκα νούμμων μόσχον καλὴν; which is thus to be distinguished, and reduced to iambics;

——Κᾶρυξ ἰὼν
Εὐθὺς πρίω μοι δέκα νούμμων μόσχον καλήν.‡

[e] Pollux, p. 436. [=1056. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[f] Varro de L. L. p. 41. [42.—D.]

[* *Poll.* p. 1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[† *Poll.* p. 1056. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[‡ Valckenaer, ad *Adon.* v. 16. (*Theocr. Decem Eidyl.*), cites this passage, and reads νόμων and καλάν, adding, " Conf. Bentlei. c. Boyl. p. 263. [ed. Len.] sed " sic Epicharmum suspicor suo ævo vocem scripsisse νόμων, quam posteà aliter " scribebant, *nummos, νούμμους,* Tabula Heracleënsis vocat ΝΟΜΩΣ, 75." — Toup, *Emend. in Suid.* I. 419., reads νόμων and καλάν: and, *Emend. in Poll.* IV. 382., unhappily proposes Εὐθὺς πριῶ νούμμων δέκα μοι μόσχον καλήν.—D.]

There seems to be no room for doubting but that the verses were thus written by the poet; and yet the reader may take notice that there's a spondee in the fourth place instead of an iambic; but then it is softened by two short syllables that come immediately before it. The same measure seems to be used in the second fragment of Epicharmus, cited by Pollux; *Ἀλλ' ὅμως καλαὶ καὶ πῖοι ἄρνες εὑρήσουσι δέ μοι καὶ νούμμους, πωλατιᾶι* γὰρ ἐντὶ τᾶς ματρός*; which is thus reducible to trochaics, though here the MS. do not assist us;

Ἀλλ' ὅμως καλαί τε πῖοι τ' ἄρνες εὑρήσουσί μοι
Δέκα νούμμους, πωλατέαι γὰρ ἐντὶ μετὰ τᾶς ματέρος.†

Πῖος I take to be a true Doric word, from whence come *πιότερος, πιότατος*.

The Divisions of the ΛΙΤΡΑ.

ΠΕΝΤΟΥΓΚΙΟΝ, a coin of five ounces brass, or of silver equivalent to them, is mentioned by Epicharmus in that fragment produced above;

——*Ἑξάντων τε, καὶ πεντουγκίων.*

The Latins called it *quincunx*. And perhaps, as the Latins had the *septunx* too, so the Sicilians might have *ἑπτούγκιον*, though we have now no author that mentions it. I will correct here a passage of Festus, which has created some trouble to the learned antiquaries of this and the last age. *Sextantarii asses*, &c. *The asses*, says he, *of two ounces weight, called* sextantarii, *came into use in the second Punic*

[* Eds. of Pollux *πωλατιᾶς*.—D.]

[† Toup, *Emend. in Suid.* I. 419., reads *νόμως*: and, *Emend. in Poll.* IV. 382., proposes an alteration of the line, so objectionable in all respects, that it need not be quoted here.—Koen (*ad Greg. Cor.* p. 130.) would read *πωλατικᾶς γὰρ ἐντὶ τᾶς ματρός, sunt enim matris vendacis.*—D.]

war; to which he adds, *septuennio quoque* (anno) *usus est, ut priore numero; sed id non permansit in usu, nec amplius processit in majorem.*[g] Here Festus is very much blamed by Budæus, Hottoman, Harduin, and others, for affirming that the *sextantarii asses* continued in use seven years only, since it plainly appears from Pliny that they lasted a good while longer. But the fault is not in Festus, but in those that transcribed him ill; for the true reading is thus, SEPTUNCIO *quoque* VARRO *usus est, ut priore numero,* &c. that is, *Varro used the word* septuncium, *as he did the number before it* (sextans); *but the word did not continue in use, nor did the compounds from* uncia *go to a higher number than seven.* He means, the Latins did not say *octuncium, nonuncium, decuncium.* But let us hear Varro himself, who will be voucher for this emendation. *Septunx, à septem et unciâ conclusum. Reliqua obscuriora, quòd à deminutione: et ea quæ deminuuntur, ita sunt ut extremas syllabas habeant: ut à duodecim unâ demptâ unciâ, deunx: dextans, dempto sextante: dodrans, dempto quadrante: bes, ut olim des, dempto triente.*[h] The meaning of which is, that they went no higher than *septunx* in the compounds from the number and *uncia,* but they said *bes* for VIII. ounces, *dodrans* for IX., *dextans* for X., *deunx* for XI.: so that, when Festus tells us in another place, *Nonuncium, quod vulgò magistri ludi appellant, significat novem uncias,* we are to understand him, that *nonuncium,* though it was used by schoolmasters when they taught boys, was no legitimate word, nor of popular use.

ΤΡΙΑΣ. ΤΕΤΡΑΣ. ΕΞΑΣ. The account that Pollux gives of the divisions of the λίτρα is exscribed from Aristotle's book of the *Himeræan Polity:* the passages are very faulty; but, because they come twice over, they may easily be corrected, by comparing one with the other, and both with the Roman monies which were borrowed from Sicily.

[g] Festus, in Sextant.

[h] Varro de L. L. iv. p. 41. [42.—D.]

Ἀριστοτέλης, says he, *ἐν τῇ Ἱμεραίων πολιτείᾳ φησὶν, ὡς οἱ μὲν Σικελιῶται τοὺς δύο χαλκοῦς ἑξάλιτρα* (p. 436. *ἓξ τάλαντα*) *καλοῦσι, τὸν δὲ ἕνα οὐγκίαν, τοὺς δὲ τρεῖς τριάκοντα* (p. 436. *τρία τάλαντα*) *τοὺς δὲ ἓξ ἡμίλιτρον, τὸν δὲ ὀβολὸν λίτραν, τὸν δὲ Κορίνθιον στατῆρα δεκάλιτρον, ὅτι δέκα ὀβολοὺς δύναται.*[i] Where the first error of the copiers is *ἑξάλιτρα* in one place, and *ἓξ τάλαντα* in the other: in the former place the Vossian and Palatine MSS. have it *δίξαντα*, in the latter they vary not from the editions. Now, from all the three words compared together, the true reading easily results, *ἑξᾶντα*: so Hesychius, *Ἑξᾶς, εἶδος* (*νομίσματος*) *παρὰ Συρακουσίοις*; and Arcadius the grammarian, in his MS. tract *περὶ Τόνων*, quoted by Salmasius,[j] *Ἑξᾶς ἐπὶ ποσότητος ὃν περισπᾶται*, which is word for word too in Theodosius's MS. Epitome of Herodian's book called *Καθόλου*, in the public library at Oxford. And we met with the word just now in the fragment of Epicharmus,

Δεκαλιτρῶν τε πλῆρες, ἑξάντων τε, καὶ πεντουγκίων.

For the MS. there reads it *ἑξάντιον*; and it's well known that *ιο* are commonly mistaken by copiers for *ω*. I myself have had frequent experience of it in sheets from the press: as in my *Notes* on Callimachus, it's somewhere printed *τῶν* instead of *τῖον*. The second mistake of Pollux's copiers is *τριάκοντα* and *τρία τάλαντα* for *τριᾶντα*. Hesychius, *Τριᾶντος πόρνη, λαμβάνουσα τριάκοντα, ὅ ἐστι λεπτὰ εἴκοσι.* Here again is the very same error that the copiers of Pollux committed, *τριάκοντα* instead of *τριᾶντα*. For this and *ἑξᾶς* being foreign words, and not commonly understood in Greece, had the common fate of all words of that sort, to be corrupted by transcribers.

ΟΥΓΚΙΑ. So the MS. has it, instead of *οὐγγία*, and

[i] Pollux, p. 216, 436. [=454, 1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[j] Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 256. [The treatise of Arcadius was printed in 1820, edited by Mr. E. H. Barker.—D.]

that's the truer reading, though it's written both ways in the books of the Greek physicians, in the time of the Roman empire, when they speak of weights and doses. Photius in his MS. Lexicon, *Οὐγκίαν, τὸν σταθμὸν, Σώφρων καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος.* Suidas, *Οὐγκία, εἶδος μέτρου, ἢ σταθμός.*

The ancient writers were content to be moderately accurate in their comparisons of monies. They commonly reckoned the Roman *denare* to be equivalent to an Attic *drachm,* though in strict examination they were not so. But they thought it better to neglect those fractions, for the convenience of expressing themselves in round sums; and they considered they were historians, and not masters of the mint. We have an instance of this in the very thing that now lies before us; where the Sicilian money is thus adjusted by Aristotle to the monies of Greece; *An οὐγκία,* says he, *is one Attic chalcus, and the ἡμιλίτριον is six chalci, and the litra is an Æginæan obolus.*[k] Now, if we examine this rigidly, the computation cannot be true. For the *litra,* according to Aristotle, contained XII. Attic *chalci,* and yet was equal to an Æginean *obolus;* so that, by this reckoning, the Æginean *obolus* was equal to XII. *chalci.* But the Æginean *obolus* was to the Attic as X. is to VI.; and the Attic *obolus* had the value of VIII. *chalci:* therefore the Æginean *obolus* was not equal to XII. *chalci,* for the proportion of XII. to VIII. is not the same with the proportion of X. to VI. But, as I said before, such small differences were neglected by the old writers, and they were content if their calculations were tolerably exact. Diodorus Siculus says, *the πεντηκοντάλιτρον of Demareta was equivalent to* X. *Attic drachms:* by which computation a *δεκάλιτρον* was equal to II. Attic drachms. But Aristotle computes that a *δεκάλιτρον* was equivalent to XII. Æginean *oboli,* which are more than II. Attic drachms. The same Aristotle assigns *τρία ἡμιοβόλια, an obolus and a half,* as an equivalent to the Sicilian *νοῦμμος*; where he seems to mean the Æginean

[k] Pollux, p. 216, 156. [p. 454, 1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

obolus; and at that rate the *νοῦμμος* was the fourth part of an Æginean drachm. But as the *nummus* at Rome was the IVth of the *denarius,* so the *νοῦμμος* in Sicily seems to have been the IVth of the *δεκάλιτρον.* The *δεκάλιτρον,* therefore, by this reckoning, was equal to an Æginean drachm, or to one Attic drachm and $\frac{2}{3}$. And it's no great wonder if Aristotle in different books should make such different computations; since in one and the same paragraph his accounts, as we have seen, are not consistent. But the learned Salmasius and Gronovius, instead of *τρία ἡμιοβόλια* in Pollux, read it *τρίτον ἡμιοβόλιον, two oboli and a half;* and if this correction be admitted, the calculation will be the juster. For, a litra being equal to an obolus, the *νοῦμμος,* two oboli and a half, will be exactly the IVth part of the *δεκάλιτρον*; as the *nummus,* being two *asses* and [a] half at Rome, and therefore called the *sestertius,* was the IVth of a denare. And indeed it must needs be owned, whether we read *τρία ἡμιοβόλια* or *τρίτον ἡμιοβόλιον,* that as IV. nummi made a denarius, so IV. *νοῦμμοι* made a *δεκάλιτρον*; as the passage of Festus compared with Pollux, and the Roman accounts compared with the Sicilian, make it plain beyond controversy.

The Roman TRIENS signified a third part of an *as,* or of XII. ounces, the QUADRANS a fourth, and the SEXTANS a sixth. This is certain, and needs not now to be proved. But yet, among the Sicilians, from whom the Romans borrowed those words, a *ΤΡΙΑΣ* is said to mean three parts of the *λίτρα,* or three ounces, not the third part of it, or four ounces; and so *ΤΕΤΡΑΣ* to be four ounces, and *ΕΚΤΑΣ* to be six ounces; which makes a very wide difference between the accounts of the two nations. *Τρεῖς χαλκοῖ,* says Pollux,[1] *ὅπερ τριᾶντα*; and again, *Τριᾶντα ὅπερ τρεῖς χαλκοῖ,* that is, *a ΤΡΙΑΣ means three ounces. Τετρᾶς δηλοῖ τέσσαρας χαλκοῦς,* says Hesychius, *a ΤΕΤΡΑΣ stands for four ounces.* And in another place, *Τριᾶντα,*

[1] Pollux, p. 216, 436. [=454, 1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

ὅπερ λεπτὰ εἴκοσι, a ΤΡΙΑΣ is xx. *lepta.* Which is the same again with three chalci or ounces, one chalcus containing vii. lepta. What shall we say to this matter? must we disbelieve these grammarians? or suppose their copiers have done them wrong? or must we take it at their words, that the Sicilians reckoned so, though we do not know why? Jos. Scaliger supposes[m] that the Sicilians took those words in the same sense as the Romans did; and that the grammarians were mistaken, *though,* says he, *it is not so much a mistake as an* idiotism; *for the vulgar used to call a division into* iv. *parts* tetrantes, *and into* viii. octantes, *as we may see in Vitruvius.* On the contrary, Salmasius maintains[n] *that the grammarians are in the right, and that the Sicilians took τριᾶς, and τετρᾶς, and δεκᾶς, for* iii., iv., *and* x. *parts of* xii. *ounces or litræ; and that the Romans were to blame for changing the meaning of those words; and that Vitruvius's sense of them is not an* idiotism, *but the true and proper notion.* If so mean a writer as I am may have the liberty to interpose in the controversy of such great men, I am persuaded the thing was thus. Both Sicilians and Romans had the same notion and use of the words: *τριᾶς* and *triens, τετρᾶς* and *tetrans* or *quadrans, ἑξᾶς* and *sextans,* meant the iiid, ivth, and vith part of any whole, whatsoever was spoken of; so that when they were applied to a pound weight of xii. ounces, they must signify iv., iii., and ii. ounces. Thus far I agree with Scaliger; and I think Salmasius was quite out when he espoused the other opinion. For the words themselves refute him; all we have of them of this form in the division of the litra being only these three, *ἑξᾶς, τριᾶς,* and *τετρᾶς*; but if *ἑξᾶς* meant six ounces, and so the rest, then we should have had other such divisions of the litra, *ἑπτᾶς* for vii. ounces, *ὀκτᾶς* for viii., *ἐννεᾶς* for ix., *δεκᾶς* for x., *ἑνδεκᾶς* for xi. On the other side, if *ἑξᾶς* signify the vith part of the pound, that is, ii. ounces, and

[m] Scalig. de Re Num. p. 5, 6.
[n] Salmas. de Modo Usur. p. 254, &c.

the other two words in like manner, then the reason is plain, why we have no more divisions of it than those three; because they are the only divisions of XII. that make even numbers, all the rest producing fractions; as πεντᾶς, a vth of XII. ounces, would be II. ounces and $\frac{1}{10}$* of an ounce; ἑπτᾶς, a VIIth, would be I. ounce and $\frac{5}{7}$; ὀκτᾶς, an VIIIth, would be I. ounce and $\frac{1}{2}$; ἐννεᾶς, a IXth, would be I. ounce and $\frac{1}{3}$; δεκᾶς, a Xth, would be I. ounce and $\frac{1}{5}$; ἑνδεκᾶς, a XIth, would be I. ounce and $\frac{1}{11}$. These being all fractions, the Sicilians would not coin any money of these several divisions, because, instead of being useful, they would puzzle and confound all reckonings. But if Salmasius's opinion were true, we should certainly have had πεντᾶς for a coin of V. ounces; for we are sure they had money of that weight, but then they did not call it πεντᾶς, but πεντούγκιον, as in the fragment of Epicharmus;

——— Ἑξάντων τε, καὶ πεντουγκίων.

This single word πεντούγκιον is a demonstration against Salmasius. For as the Romans, taking quadrans for a IVth part of XII. ounces, could not express the notion of a V. ounce piece by quintans, but by quincunx, so, by the way of reverse, the Sicilians, expressing a V. ounce piece by πεντούγκιον, could not mean IV. ounces by τετρᾶς, but the IVth part of XII. ounces. Again, we are told by Pollux, that the Sicilians took ἑξᾶντα for II. ounces; but according to Salmasius, ἑξᾶς must mean a VI. ounce piece, which is utterly improbable upon another account, because ἑξᾶς would then be the same with ἡμιλίτριον. But as the Romans used semissis to denote a piece of VI. ounces, and had therefore no such word as sexunx, so the Sicilians, having the word ἡμιλίτριον, or VI. ounces, as appears from Epicharmus, Aristotle, and Pollux, had no need to say ἑξ-

[* Altered to "$\frac{2}{5}$" in the ed. of 1777, where is the following note: "Dr. "Bentley had printed it II. ounces and $\frac{1}{10}$; too hastily supposing $\frac{2}{5}$ to have "been equal to $\frac{1}{10}$."—D.]

ούγκιον or *ἑξᾶς* for the same weight. 'Tis true, in some MSS. of Pollux 'tis not *ἑξᾶντα*, but *διξᾶντα*; and Salmasius is pleased to prefer that reading, as a Doricism, from *διξός*. But it's only in one place of Pollux that the MSS. have it *διξ*; in the other they all read it *εξ*. And, with submission, they were not the Dorians, but the Ionians, that used *διξὸς* for *δισσὸς*, as we see in xx. places of Herodotus. And if the Sicilians used *διξᾶντα* in Salmasius's sense, why did they not say *τριξᾶντα*, but *τριᾶντα*? for Herodotus has *τριξοὶ* for *τρισσοὶ*, as well as *διξοὶ* for *δισσοί*. Upon all accounts, then, I espouse the opinion of Scaliger, against that of Salmasius: but in the remaining part of the dispute I humbly conceive they are both mistaken; the one, while he excuses the use of *τριᾶς* and *τετρᾶς* for III. and IV. parts of XII., as an *idiotism*, which may be justified by Vitruvius; the other, while he thinks Vitruvius must be taken in that sense which he esteems the true notion of the words. The passage of Vitruvius is thus; *Dividuntur circinationes . . . tetrantibus in partes quatuor, vel octantibus in partes octo, ductis lineis.*[o] Scaliger interprets these *tetrantes* and *octantes* to be a square and an octagon inscribed in a circle; which mistake is so palpable, that it needs no refutation. Salmasius says, *tetrans* here means a thing with IV. parts, and *octans* a thing with VIII. On the contrary, to me it seems evident that Vitruvius takes *tetrans* for a quadrant, or the IVth part of a circle, and *octans* for the VIIIth part. *A circle*, says he, *must be divided into* IV. *parts, tetrantibus.* If *tetrans* had meant all the IV. parts, he would not have said *tetrantibus*, but *tetrante*. But there's another place that plainly shews what he understands by *tetrans*. *Ducatur . . rotunda circinatio . . . . et in eâ catheto respondens diametros agatur. Tunc ab summo sub abaco inceptum in singulis tetrantorum actionibus dimidiatum oculi spatium minuatur, donicùm in eundem tetrantem, qui est sub oculo,* veniat.*[p] Here he supposes a circle to be divided by two diameters at right

[o] Vitruvius, x. 11.

[p] Vitruvius, iii. 3.

[* Eds. of Vitruv. "sub *abaco*."—D.]

angles, that is, into IV. equal parts; and these IV. parts he calls *tetrantorum*, and one IVth he calls *tetrantem*. So that Vitruvius's notion of *tetrans* and *octans* does not differ from the received notion of *quadrans* among the Romans, as Scaliger and Salmasius thought. They were taken by Vitruvius, and every body else, for the IVth and VIIIth part of any whole whatsoever; and all the words of that form that could be applied to the divisions of the *as* or *libra* have the very same meaning; *sextans* the VIth part of the whole *as*, *triens* the IIId, *quadrans* the IVth; and so among the Sicilians, ἑξᾶς, τριᾶς, τετρᾶς. *Octans*, indeed, was not used as a division of the *libra*, because, as I observed before, it would have made a troublesome fraction; but it was used in the division of other things, whether magnitude or number, as here by Vitruvius for the VIIIth part of a circle. So ΔΕΚΑΣ, a Sicilian word mentioned by Arcadius,[q] Τὸ δεκᾶς περισπᾶται, ὅτε* ἐπὶ ποσότητος τάσσεται, though it was no species of money, for the reason above named, yet it was a name of measure and quantity, and denoted the Xth part of any thing. It appears, then, from the whole account, that the ancient Romans had all their names and species of money from the Dorians of Sicily and Italy, and continued every word in its original sense. And because money was first coined at Rome by Servius Tullius, who began his reign Olymp. L. 4., and died Olymp. LXI. 4., and consequently was contemporary with Phalaris, 'tis a plain case that in Phalaris's time, as well as afterwards, the Sicilians had those species of money.

After I had prepared this defence of my account of the Sicilian talent, I observed that Mr. B. in his second Edition had made some few additions to his remarks upon this article. At first he told us, *it would not, perhaps, be difficult to offer some emendations of Pollux, that might set these things right* (p. 81.): but it seems, for some secret reasons,

[q] Salmas. p. 256. [De Modo Usur.—D.]

[* ὅτι. Salm. *ibid.*—D.]

he would not oblige us with them. But in his 2d Edition, being in better humour; *not to be too reserved*, says he, *with the Dr., I shall now offer what may set Pollux right, and I wish the Dr. himself were as capable of emendation* (ibid). I thank the gentleman for his good wish; but if he can give me no better *emendation* than this that he has given Pollux, he would be no better *a director* to me than somebody has been to him. His first *conjecture is, that* ἓξ τάλαντα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ δύο χαλκοῖ, *is an error of the copyists* for ἑξάλιτρον.[r] A profound conjecture indeed! 'tis but borrowed from the other place of Pollux,[s] where the text has it ἑξάλιτρα; and I have proved above that both places are corrupted, and that the true reading is ἑξᾶντα. *Which* ἑξάλιτρον, says Mr. B., *signified the* VI*th part of a litra; and so the rest of the compounds of* λίτρα *in the same manner.* Here our *Emendator* makes ἑξάλιτρον mean *the* VI*th part of a litra*, which, by all analogy and all examples of authors, must needs mean VI. *whole litræ;* so that he's out of his reckoning no less than *six times six.* What thinks he of ἑξάμηνος, ἑξαήμερος, ἑξαέτης, ἑξάπηχυς, ἑξαδάκτυλος, ἑξάδραχμος, ἑξάστιχος, and XX. more? Must these signify the VIth of a *month, day,* or *year,* &c., or, as all the world has yet supposed, must they mean VI. *months,* VI. *days,* VI. *years,* and so on? According to Mr. B.'s wise computation, the δεκάλιτρον must not be ten litræ, but the tenth of a litra, which is a hundred times less than Aristotle and Pollux dreamed of. The πεντηκοντάλιτρον must not be L. *litræ*, but the LIth of a litra, which is 2500 less than poor Diodorus Siculus thought it, who values it at X. Attic drachms. The prisoner's chains, that Diphilus [Dinolochus] calls τετρακοντάλιτροι,[t] must not be XL. pound weight, but the XLIth part of a pound, which would not be quite so *heavy* as some of those in Newgate. But of all men Aristophanes is in the most dangerous condition with his

[r] Pollux, p. 436. [=1057. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[s] Id. p. 216. [=454. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

[t] Id. p. 216. [=454. *ed. Hemst.*—See p. 60. of this volume.—D.]

Πόθεν ἂν λάβοιμι ῥῆμα μυριάμφορον;[u]

for he wished here for something *that would hold the measure of* 10,000 *casks:* but Mr. B. can tell him that it means no more *than the* 10,000*th part of a cask;* so that either the poet or Mr. B. are mistaken a hundred millions in the reckoning. After so glorious a beginning, Mr. B. tells us in the next sentence, *that the Sicilian talent was a piece of silver that answered to* LX. *litræ of brass.* It seems he cannot open his mouth without mistaking; for the talent was no *piece of silver,* nor a single coin, but a *sum,* as a pound sterling is in English; and 'twas reckoned a talent, whether it was paid in silver or brass, whether with VI. silver *δεκάλιτρα,* or XXIV. *νοῦμμοι,* or LX. *λίτραι,* or CXX. *ἡμιλίτρια,* or all in *ἑξᾶντες* or *οὐγκίαι* of brass; just as a pound here is the same, whether it be paid in crowns, or shillings, or half-pennies, or farthings. His very next sentence acquaints us, *that this* LX. *pound weight of brass was then divided into* XXIV. *pieces called νοῦμμοι, each νοῦμμος being equal to two pounds and a half, which the Romans would have called* nummus sestertius, *as they would have called* IV. *of them a* decussis. Here are three mistakes in the compass of one proposition; so very fruitful is Mr. B. in those happy productions. The Sicilian *νοῦμμος* he makes to be *a brass piece* of 2 pound and ½, which was a small piece of silver about the weight of three pence English. Aristotle says, the Tarentine *νοῦμμος* had stamped upon it *ΤΑΡΑΣ* astride upon a dolphin; and there are several silver ones of that sort yet preserved, but nothing like it in brass. And indeed the absurdity of the Examiner's notion is visible at first view; for who would stamp any species of 2 pound and ½ weight? the heaviest coin was but one pound, and higher than that they did not go. He mistakes again when he teaches us that the Romans would have called that brass piece of 2 pound and ½ a *nummus sestertius.* For the Roman *sestertius* was, like the Sicilian, of silver: *In*

[u] Aristoph. in Pace. [v. 513. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

argento, says Varro, *nummus, id à Siculis*. There was no such coin as *sestertius* till the second Punic war, when silver money came into use. Then, he says, they would have called four of those brass pieces *a decussis*. Here he imagines that *decussis* was a particular coin, which was a sum of XII. asses, or of XII. pound weight of uncoined brass; so were *tressis, quinquessis, octussis*, and so on to *centussis*, all sums, and not species; though some learned men have maintained these to be coins, and the *sestertius* to be brass too, and so might lead Mr. B. out of the way. In the next place, he proceeds to give an account how the Sicilian talent of XXIV. *νοῦμμοι* came to sink so low as XII. *νοῦμμοι*: but his suppositions, being bottomed upon those two mistakes, that the talent was a single coin of silver, and the *νοῦμμος* a coin of brass, they must needs be all mistake too, and the superstructure be like the foundation. If the readers be not yet tired with his endless blunders, they may see what work he makes of this in pag. 81.

But the strangest thing of all, if any thing, besides being in the right, can be now thought strange in our Examiner, is the flat contradictions between this new addition and what Mr. B. had said here before. The old part is to prove that the low Sicilian talent is a mere figment; the new is to make it probable that there was a low talent, and to shew how it came to be so: the old decries the passage of Pollux, as *so obscure and interpolated* (p. 88.) that nothing can be made on't; the new offers to clear it up, and *to set the thing right*, to make way for the low value of the talent: the old undervalues Festus, and corrects it 3000 denares instead of 3 (p. 83, 84.); the new espouses the present reading 3, and would reconcile it with other writers: in the old the *ἑξάλιτρον* is interpreted VI. litræ (p. 80.), in the new it's but II.; in the old, *he has good reason not to admit that the Sicilian νοῦμμος was the same with the Roman* sestertius (p. 79.); in the new, he readily admits and plainly supposes it: in the old, *a talent may be brass, and equal to a litra* (p. 89.); in the new, *the talent is a piece of silver, and*

answers to LX. *litræ.* Now, if the old text had been cashiered and struck out, we might allow this new addition as the Examiner's second thoughts, and give him the common right of changing his former opinion upon better consideration. But, as if it were on purpose to amaze and astonish his readers, the old text stands still as it did, and the new piece is clapt into it, as if they both consisted very well and suited together. We have had one instance before,[u] where his text and his margin, like the two faces of Janus, look quite contrary ways; but in this place not only the margin is at war with the text, but the very text too, by another addition, has a civil war within itself (p. 89). Now, the readers perhaps may be inclined to suspect that some Assistant was over-officious here, and that Mr. B. himself would not blow hot and cold with the same breath; but I would advise them not to be too rash, but to learn by my example,[v] how feeble all such arguments from reason are, in things that concern the Examiner. However, if there was any such Assistant that put in a finger here, I must own myself obliged to him; for though he bungled grievously in his work, yet his design was wholly on my side, to account for the low Sicilian talent, and to void all that Mr. B. had written about it before. And I am the more confirmed in my opinion that he was against Mr. B., because I find him playing mere booty with him; *Suppose,* says he, *there was a Sicilian talent of this low value; yet, when a talent was simply mentioned, it must mean the common talent, made up of* 60 *minæ, and those divided each into* 100 *drachmæ, and these into oboli* (p. 89). This looks now like a salvo, to come off with Mr. B., and to reconcile the new piece and the old together; but it's perfectly a banter upon him, and seems designed for a piece of nonsense; for the meaning of it is exactly thus: *Though a current talent in Sicily was but worth about half a crown; yet when a talent was mentioned in Sicily, it must mean* 180 *pound sterling.* But we may

[u] See here, vol. i. p. 224. [v] See p. 15, &c. of this vol.

was any poem upon Clearista among the works of Stesichorus, whence our Sophist might take the plot and ground-work of this story, or whether all is entirely his own invention and manufacture, I will not pretend to guess. But let those believe that can, that such stuff as this busied the head of the Tyrant; at least they must confess then, though the *Letters* would represent him as a great admirer and judge too of poetry, that he was a mere *asinus ad lyram.* For, in the LXXIX. Epist. he calls this poem upon Clearista μέλος and μελῳδίαν, which must here (as it almost ever does) signify a *lyric ode,** since it is spoken of Stesichorus, a melic or lyric poet. But in the CXLIV. he calls it an *elegy,* ἐλεγεῖον, which is as different from μέλος as Theognis is from Pindar, or Tibullus from Horace. What, the same copy of verses both an ode and an elegy? Could not some years' acquaintance with Stesichorus teach him the very names? But to forgive him, or rather the Sophist, such an egregious piece of dulness, why, forsooth, so much ado, why such a vast way about, to obtain a few verses? Could not they have writ directly to Stesichorus, and at the price of some present have met with easy success? Do not we know, that all of that string, Bacchylides, Simonides, Pindar, got their livelihood by the Muses? So that, to use Phalaris's intercession, besides the delay and an unnecessary trouble to both, was to defraud the poet of his fee.

Nay, certainly, they might have employed any

[* "Plato Ion. p. 146. B. Læmar. μέλος de *Homeri* versibus." DOBREE, *Advers.* II. 367.—D.]

expect to have this passage cleared *when Mr. B. and the* Assistant *next see one another:* and then too he may please to resolve whether he will still oppose my account of the Sicilian money; or, if not, *renounce,* as he *promises, not some particular Epistles only, but the whole set of them.*

XV.

But, to let pass all further arguments from words and language, to me the very matter and business of the *Letters* sufficiently discovers them to be an imposture. What force of wit and spirit in the style, what lively painting of humour, some fancy they discern there, I will not examine nor dispute. But, methinks, little sense and judgment is shewn in the ground-work and subject of them. What an improbable and absurd story is that of the LIV. Epistle! Stesichorus was born at Himera; but he chanced to die at Catana, a hundred miles distance from home, quite across the island. There he was buried, and a noble monument made for him.[w] Thus far the Sophist had read in good authors. Now, upon this, he introduces the Himerenses so enraged at the others for having Stesichorus's ashes, that nothing less will serve them than *denouncing war, and sacking their city.* And presently an embassy is sent to Phalaris, to desire his assistance, who, like a generous ally, promises them what arms and men and money they would; but, withal, sprinkles a little dust among the bees, advising them to milder counsels, and proposing this expedient, that Catana should have Stesichorus's tomb, and Himera should build a temple to

[w] Suidas, Πάντα ὀκτὼ et Στησιχ.

him. Now, was ever any declamator's theme so extravagantly put? What, to go to war upon so slight an occasion, and to call in too the assistance of the Tyrant? Had they so soon forgot Stesichorus's own counsel?[x] who, when, upon another occasion, they would have asked succour of Phalaris, dissuaded them by the fable of the *horse* and his *rider*. Our Sophist had heard that seven cities *contended* about Homer, and so two might go to blows about another poet. But there's a difference between that contention and this fighting in earnest. He is as extravagant too in the honours he would raise to his poet's memory; nothing less than a temple and deification. Cicero tells us, that in his days there was his statue still extant at Himera (then called Thermæ), which one would think was honour enough. But a Sophist can build temples in the air as cheaply and easily as some others do castles.

What an inconsistency is there between the LI. and LXIX. Epistles! In the former he declares his immortal hatred to one Python, who, after Phalaris's flight from Astypalæa, would have persuaded his wife Erythia to a second marriage with himself; but seeing her resolved to follow her husband, he poisoned her. Now, this could be no long time after his banishment, for then she could not have wanted opportunities of following him. But in the LXIX. Epist. we have her alive again, long after that Phalaris had been Tyrant of Agrigentum, for he mentions his growing old there.[y] And we must not imagine but that several years had passed, before he

[x] Aristot. Rhet. l. ii.

[y] Διὰ τὸ ἐπιὸν γῆρας. Ep. 69.

could seize the government of so populous a city, that had 200,000 souls[a] in it, or, as others say, 800,000.[a] For he came an indigent stranger thither, according to the *Letters;* and by degrees rising from one employment to another, at last had opportunity and power to effect that design. Besides, in the LXIX. Letter she is at Crete with her son; and in the LI. she is poisoned (I suppose) at Astypalæa, for there her poisoner dwelt; and 'tis expressly said, she designed, but could not follow her husband. Which seems an intimation, that the Sophist believed Astypalæa to be a city in Crete. 'Tis certain that the editors of Phalaris, by comparing these two passages together, made that discovery in geography; for it could not be learned any where else; and 'tis an admirable token, both that the *Epistles* are old and genuine, and that the commentators are not inferior to, nor unworthy of, their author.

What a scene of putid and senseless formality are the LXXIIX.,* LXXIX., and CXLIV. Epistles! Nicocles a Syracusian, a man of the highest rank and quality, sends his own brother an hundred miles with a request to Phalaris, that he would send to Stesichorus, another hundred miles, and beg the favour of a copy of verses upon Clearista his wife, who was lately dead. Phalaris accordingly sends to Himera with mighty application and address, and soon after writes a second letter of thanks for so singular a kindness. Upon the fame of this, one Pelopidas entreats him that he would procure the like favour for a friend of his.[b] lse. Now, whether there

[a] Diog. Laërt. in Empedoc.

was any poem upon Clearista among the works of Stesichorus, whence our Sophist might take the plot and ground-work of this story, or whether all is entirely his own invention and manufacture, I will not pretend to guess. But let those believe that can, that such stuff as this busied the head of the Tyrant; at least they must confess then, though the *Letters* would represent him as a great admirer and judge too of poetry, that he was a mere *asinus ad lyram.* For, in the LXXIX. Epist. he calls this poem upon Clearista μέλος and μελῳδίαν, which must here (as it almost ever does) signify a *lyric ode,** since it is spoken of Stesichorus, a melic or lyric poet. But in the CXLIV. he calls it an *elegy,* ἐλεγεῖον, which is as different from μέλος as Theognis is from Pindar, or Tibullus from Horace. What, the same copy of verses both an ode and an elegy? Could not some years' acquaintance with Stesichorus teach him the very names? But to forgive him, or rather the Sophist, such an egregious piece of dulness, why, forsooth, so much ado, why such a vast way about, to obtain a few verses? Could not they have writ directly to Stesichorus, and at the price of some present have met with easy success? Do not we know, that all of that string, Bacchylides, Simonides, Pindar, got their livelihood by the Muses? So that, to use Phalaris's intercession, besides the delay and an unnecessary trouble to both, was to defraud the poet of his fee.

Nay, certainly, they might have employed any

[* "Plato Ion. p. 146. B. Læmar. μέλος de *Homeri* versibus." DOBREE, *Advers.* II. 367.—D.]

hand rather than Phalaris's. For, begging pardon of the *Epistles*, I suspect all to be a cheat about Stesichorus's friendship with him. For the poet, out of common gratitude, must needs have celebrated it in some of his works. But that he *did not*, the *Letters* themselves are, in this point, a sufficient witness. For, in the LXXIX. Phalaris is feigned to entreat him not once to mention his name in his books. This was a sly fetch of our Sophist, to prevent so shrewd an objection from Stesichorus's silence as to any friendship at all with him. But that cunning shall not serve his turn. For what if Phalaris had really wished him to decline mentioning his name? Stesichorus knew the world well enough, that those sort of requests are but a modest simulation, and a disobedience would have been easily pardoned. In the LXXIV. Letter the Tyrant proclaims and glories to his enemy Orsilochus, that Pythagoras had stayed five months with him: why should he then seek to conceal from posterity the twelve years' familiarity with Stesichorus? Pindar, exhorting Hiero the Tyrant of Syracuse to be kind to poets and men of letters, tells him how Crœsus had immortal praise for his friendship and bounty to them, *but the memory of that cruel and inhospitable Phalaris was hated and cursed every where.*[c] How could Pindar have said this, had he heard of his extraordinary dearness with Stesichorus? For their acquaintance, according to the *Letters*, was as memorable and as glorious as that of Crœsus with Æsop and Solon. So that Pindar,

[c] Pyth. i. Τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυ | τῆρα νηλέα νόον | Ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾶ φάτις. [v. 185. *ed. Heyn.*—D.]

had he known it, for that sole kindness to his fellow-poet, would have forborne so vile a character. Plato, in his second Epistle, recounts to Dionysius some celebrated friendships of learned men with tyrants and magistrates; Simonides's with Hiero and Pausanias, Thales's with Periander, Anaxagoras's with Pericles, Solon's and others' with Crœsus. Now, how could he have missed, had he ever heard of it, this of Stesichorus with Phalaris? being transacted in Sicily, and so a most proper and domestic example. If you say, the infamy of Phalaris made him decline that odious instance, in that very word you pronounce our *Epistles* to be spurious. For if they had been known to Plato, even Phalaris would have appeared as moderate a tyrant as Dionysius himself. Lucian,[d] that feigns an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi for the dedication of the Brazen Bull, makes an oration in his praise, as Isocrates does of Busiris, where, without doubt, he has gathered all the stories he knew for topics of his commendation; but he has not one word of his friendship with Stesichorus. Nor, indeed, has any body else. And do not you yet begin to suspect the credit of the *Letters?*

'Twould be endless to prosecute this part, and shew all the silliness and impertinency in the matter of the *Epistles*. For, take them in the whole bulk, they are a fardle of commonplaces, without any life or spirit from action and circumstance. Do but cast your eye upon Cicero's letters, or any statesman's, as Phalaris was: what lively characters of men there! what descriptions of place! what notifications

[d] In Phalar. prior.

of time! what particularity of circumstances! what multiplicity of designs and events! When you return to these again, you feel, by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming pedant with his elbow on his desk; not with an active, ambitious tyrant, with his hand on his sword, commanding a million of subjects. All that takes or affects you is a stiffness and stateliness and operoseness of style; but as that is improper and unbecoming in all epistles, so especially it is quite aliene from the character of Phalaris, a man of business and despatch.

Mr. B. begins the examination of this article with a pedantic digression and commonplace about *pedantry*, which I will not now meddle with, but reserve for a more proper place; that I may not, as he has done, interrupt the business of this section with an impertinent excursion that has no manner of relation to't.

The first absurdity that I noted in the matter of the *Epistles* was *the Himeræans going to* WAR *with the Catanæans about Stesichorus's ashes, and calling in Phalaris to their assistance, against Stesichorus's own advice in a case exactly like it.* Now, the Examiner pretends to answer this; but, with greater craft than ingenuity, he drops the principal part of it. *What is there*, says he, *in this story either absurd or improbable, that the Himeræans should be so concerned to get the ashes of Stesichorus, and the Catanæans to keep them* (p. 100.)? What I, from the *Epistles*, called a *war* and *sacking of a city*,[e] and a dependence upon the most brutal of tyrants, our Honourable Examiner styles *a concern*, and says not one word about the *going to war*. But he tells us, *this very thing happened afterwards in the case of Euripides*,

[e] Ep. 54. Ἑλοῦσιν ὑμῖν πόλιν ἐν Σικελίᾳ.

whose bones the Athenians sent a solemn embassy to Macedonia to retrieve, but their request was denied. And is this the *very thing*, and the same case, with that in the *Epistles?* It's so far from being the *very thing*, that one can hardly pick out a more proper instance to refute the *Epistles*. For, as the Athenians met with a denial when they demanded Euripides's ashes, and yet declared no war upon that account, nor committed the least hostilities; so likewise the Himeræans would never go to war upon so slight an occasion, especially against a powerful city, that had the same original with their own, both colonies being founded by the Chalcidians of Eubœa. After this, he informs us, from Pausanias, *that the Athenians built a noble monument to Euripides* (p. 100.); but neither Pausanias nor Thomas Magister, who are the only authors, I suppose, that speak of it, say a word of its *nobility;* but the one calls it barely *μνῆμα Εὐριπίδου κενὸν*,[f] and the other *κενοτάφιον*,[g] without a word in its commendation. Then he tells us, out of Plutarch, *that the Orchomenians endeavoured all they could to get Hesiod's bones; but the Locrians, that had 'em, would not be prevailed upon to part with 'em* (p. 100). And here again he puts a force upon his author, and makes him say more than he really does: but though the case were so as he represents it, it would be, as the most of his are, a good argument against himself. For, as the Orchomenians did not go to war upon't, though the very oracle advised them to fetch Hesiod's bones; so the Himeræans would not have run that hazard for the sake of Stesichorus's.

I had blamed the *Epistles* for raising *a temple*[h] to Stesichorus, which the Examiner justifies from the *several temples erected to Homer at Smyrna and in other places; which the Doctor*, says he, *knew nothing of, though it be no secret even to the first beginners of learning* (p. 101). 'Tis a good proof indeed that the *first beginners* may know this thing, because

[f] Pausan. p. 2. [g] Thom. Mag. Vita Eurip. p. 100.
[h] Ep. 54. Νεὼς ἱστάσθω Στησιχόρου.

our Examiner knows it. But there's another thing that I perceive even he *knows nothing of*, that Homer's case and Stesichorus's have no relation to one another. For, I pray, at what time were the temples built to Homer? 'Twas a long time before he was honoured with so much as an epitaph. *He was buried*, says Herodotus, *in the island Ios; καὶ ὕστερον πολλῷ χρόνῳ, and a* LONG TIME *after, when his poems became famous, they made an epitaph upon him.*[i] As for his temple at Smyrna, which Strabo,[j] Cicero, and others mention, it must needs be as recent as the city itself, and that was built by Antigonus and Lysimachus six or seven hundred years after the poet's time, the old city having been ruined and desolate for 400 years together. And then the temple at Alexandria, that Ptolemy Philopater erected to his memory, was later than that at Smyrna;[k] and the Marble of Homer's Apotheosis, which is published with an ample commentary by the very learned Cuperus, may be reasonably supposed to be later than them both. What has the Examiner got, therefore, by his instances of Homer's temples? They are all near CCC. years younger than Phalaris and Stesichorus; and if a custom obtained in this latter age, will he infer that it was used too in the former? Or will he compare the fame of Stesichorus with the glory of Homer? Or will he suppose that Stesichorus could immediately obtain those honours which Homer did not till his books had lasted VI. centuries, when he was numbered among the ancient heroes? This is so poor an excuse for the Sophist, that it's a further detection of him. For, since he lived after Ptolemy's time, and had heard of Homer's temples at Alexandria and Smyrna, it might easily come into his head to build the like for Stesichorus: but the true Phalaris, in whose days even Homer himself had no temple erected to him, would never have thought on't.

But what a morose piece of critic is that, where he will

[i] Herod. Vitâ Homeri.
[j] Strabo, p. 646.
[k] Ælian. xiii. 22.

not give me leave to say, as others have done, *that Himera was afterwards called Thermæ?* (p. 101, 102.) Because, forsooth, Diodorus and Cicero say they were not built upon the same spot of ground. And yet Diodorus himself expressly calls the inhabitants of Thermæ Himeræans;[1] and Scipio, when he gave them the statues that formerly belonged to Himera, and Cicero, when he tells that story of Scipio, do both as good as declare that they looked upon them as the same city. Polybius, therefore, joins both words together, and calls them *Θερμῶν τῶν Ἱμεραίων*;[m] and so Ptolemy, *Θερμαὶ Ἱμεραι πόλις*, which Cluverius corrects *Ἱμεραῖαι*; and so an inscription in Gruter,[n] COL. AVG. HIMERAEORVM THERMIT. And if I may not say Himera was called Thermæ, because they were not upon the same spot, I must not say neither, what every body has said, that Naxos was called Taurominium, nor that Sybaris was called Thurii, no, nor that Smyrna was called Smyrna, nor Magnesia called Magnesia; for the new towns of those names were as remote from the old ones as Thermæ from Himera.

I had charged the *Letters* with an *inconsistency*, because the LIST makes Phalaris's wife to have been poisoned at Astypalæa, soon after her husband's flight, but the LXIXth makes her alive in Crete many years after, when Phalaris was grown old in the monarchy at Agrigentum. Mr. B. is pleased to reply, *that here I make an unreasonable supposition, that the* Letters *must have been written in the same order that they now stand; for if that do not take place, there's no manner of inconsistency between these two Epistles* (p. 102, 103). Now, what name ought to be given to such a writer as this is, who prevaricates so notoriously, in a case as plain as the sun? Did I ever make such a supposition, that the *Letters* were written in the order they are printed? Had I not expressly supposed, in the IVth article, that the LXXXVth Letter might be written before the

[1] Diod. p. 280.
[m] Polyb. p. 24.
[n] Gruter. p. 433.

LXXXIVth, nay, before the XXth,* nay, before the very first of all?[o] And is it not visible and plain to any man of sense, that I place the *inconsistency* here, not upon the order of the *Epistles*, but upon the differences of place and time? I would ask him now, in his own language, *was the pleasure of forging* this imaginary *supposition*, which is worthy of himself, and none of mine, *an equivalent to the shame of being told on't?*

But he tells me, *I make four other suppositions, which have not the least countenance from the* Epistles, *or any other history* (p. 103). What the Examiner will grant or deny, to me is indifferent; but I appeal to others, if every particular that I said there may not be fairly gathered from the *Letters* themselves. *Phalaris fled from Astypalæa;*[p] *his wife, endeavouring to follow him, was poisoned by Python, who courted her to a second marriage.*[q] Again, *his wife is alive in Crete, when Phalaris had long possessed the government of Agrigentum.*[r] All this is plainly affirmed in the *Letters*. Now, if Astypalæa was not a town of Crete, but an island of the Sporades, as I have proved already against Phalaris's editors, then, if she was poisoned at Astypalæa, she could not afterwards be alive in Crete. And if she was poisoned for endeavouring to follow her husband, which cannot reasonably be supposed to be very long after his flight, she could not be yet alive when he was grown old in Sicily. I must confess that these two accounts are still in my opinion *inconsistencies*. But Mr. B. and I may have very different notions of what deserves to be called by that name. For his Examination flatly contradicts his own Index to Phalaris; and his margin, in more places than one, is directly opposite to his text; and yet he seems not to apprehend them to be *inconsistent* one with another; for he has made no retractation of his Index to Phalaris, and has made his margin keep company with his text, as if they were very good friends.

[* XXIST: see vol. i. p. 204.—D.]

[o] See here, vol. i. p. 204.

[p] Ep. 4, 49.

[q] Ep. 51.

[r] Ep. 69.

My other exception against the *Epistles* was the Sophist's absurd conduct about Nicocles's address to Phalaris, to obtain by his intercession a copy of verses from Stesichorus. But the Examiner *protests he can see no harm, nor any thing unnatural in't* (p. 104). Now, this being a matter of mere judgment, and no controversy of fact, I am not surprised to see Mr. B. and myself have such different opinions about it. And when a thing is once brought to that issue, 'tis in vain to dispute further about it; but we must refer the whole matter to the readers that have taste and skill. I shall only take some short notice of the particulars that his argument is built on. He says, *Phalaris was not successful in a second attempt upon Stesichorus, at the instance of a Sicilian gentleman* (p. 104). But it's plain from the Epistle itself,[s] that Phalaris refused to make a second attempt; so that the *gentleman* was unsucccessful with Phalaris, not Phalaris with Stesichorus. Mr. B., it seems, does not know his own *favourite* book; and yet if I, that despise it, and believe it not worth the reading, had made such a mistake about it as this is, he would have given us two whole pages in aggravation of the fault, and have poured out his *grimace* and *banter* profusely upon so worthy a subject.

But *he finds I have high thoughts of Phalaris,* because I said *that such stuff as Stesichorus's verses did not busy his head* (p. 104). They were not *high thoughts* of his great monarchy, but hard ones of his cruelty and barbarity, that made me suppose such matters did not busy his head. Mr. B., then, might have saved that diminishing character that he gives here of Phalaris's power. One may guess it was much against his mind to depress his *Sicilian prince;* but his anger against his antagonist was stronger here than his sense of loyalty. But let us see how he manages? *He was only a petty prince,* he says, *of one town in Sicily.* I perceive he has not lost all his former respect for him; he'll make him *a prince* still, though it be but a *petty* one. But

[s] Ep. 65.

why so ill-natured as to allow him but one single town, Agrigentum, and in that single town too to take away half of his subjects? What will he do therefore with Suidas, who makes him *Tyrant of all Sicily?*[t] or with Diogenianus, who affirms *that he subdued the city and country of* [*the*] *Leontini?*[u] or with Polyænus, who makes him *conquer the Sicanians, and take Ouessa* (or rather *Inessa*), *their capital city?*[v] or with Diodorus, who informs us that he had two castles, Ἔκνομος λόφος and Φαλάριον,[w] in the territories of Gela, a day's journey from Agrigentum? or, lastly, what will he do with the *Epistles* themselves, which pretend he vanquished the Leontini, and the Tauromenites and Zanclæans their allies?[x] If Mr. B. pleases to take all these into the account, he may allow his *prince* to have been master of *a million of subjects;* though Agrigentum should not be so populous as Laërtius represents it. And why now would Mr. B. deal so unkindly with him, to make him *a petty prince of one city only,* when such credible authors assign him many more? Is there not, as I have often observed, a certain fatality in this gentleman's errors, so that, whether he talks for Phalaris or against him, on both sides he is always mistaken?

He goes on, and tells me, *that there have been tyrants with many millions of subjects, that have employed themselves about poems. Has not the Dr. seen,* says he, *the fragments of Augustus's letters to Horace, pressing and obliging that poet to write?* (p. 105.) Never was piece of history more aptly applied: I can heartily now forgive him all he has said about me, when I see how judicious and exact he is in bestowing names and characters. Phalaris is *a Sicilian prince* with him, and Augustus is *a tyrant.* Methinks that Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, had been a nearer and properer comparison; for he was so concerned with poets and poems, that he not only had several poets in his court, but

[t] Suid. Φάλ. τυραννήσας Σικελίας ὅλης.
[u] Diog. Παροιμιῶν ii. 50. Καταπολεμήσας τοὺς Λεοντίνους.
[v] Polyænus, v. 1.
[w] Diod. p. 741.
[x] Epist. 85.

himself made several tragedies. Though even this or any other such instance had been wholly impertinent; for, as I said, 'twas not Phalaris's greatness, but his barbarity and ignorance (being an illiterate publican before he usurped the tyranny), that makes his dealings with Stesichorus for copies of verses to be so improbable and absurd.

But *a present*, he says, had been an *improper* means to obtain verses of Stesichorus; for *he was one of the greatest men of Sicily* (p. 105, 106). This is a new piece of history, and to be sure he takes care to make it out well. Yes, by two very good arguments. First, *because, as Suidas tells him, his brother Helianax was νομοθέτης, a lawgiver.* Ay, no doubt on't, if he was a lawgiver, he must consequently be a member of parliament. But it falls out unfortunately, that the legislative power was not always in such great hands as it's now-a-days: *the best law-makers,* says Aristotle,[y] *were of the* MIDDLE *rank of citizens; for Solon was such a one, as appears by his poems; and Lycurgus, for he was no king; and Charondas, and* MOST *of the rest.* Even Aristotle himself, whose nobility was not extraordinary, made laws for the Abderitans.[z] Zaleucus, as we have seen above, was but a shepherd and a slave. Eudoxus the Cnidian made laws to his own citizens;[a] and yet he was so poor,[b] that Theomedon a physician bore his charges at Athens; and his friends made a purse for him when he was to travel to Egypt. And Protagoras was lawgiver to the Thurians,[c] and yet at first he was no better than a porter to carry burdens.[d] Why then must Stesichorus be one of the greatest men in Sicily, because he had a brother a lawgiver? The Examiner, we see, will still be true to his old way of reasoning; for one may fairly infer the very contrary from it, that he was but of *middle* and ordinary quality. Well, but he must needs *be one of the greatest men there, because*

[y] Arist. Polit. iv. 11.
[z] Laërt., Plutarch. c. Colotem.
[a] Laërt., Plut. ibid.
[b] Laërt.
[c] Laërt.
[d] Bajulus, φορμοφόρος. Gellius, v. 3.

he made an apologue to the Himeræans against Phalaris, about the horse and his rider, and the stag[e] (p. 106). And is that such a proof of his *wealth* and *greatness*, above the low temptations of money and presents? Menenius Agrippa made such another apologue to the Romans,[f] and yet he was so very poor, that he left not enough to bury him. There's another apologue too of Æsop's mentioned by Aristotle, in the very place where he tells Stesichorus's; and if Æsop, a poor slave, could make apologues at Samos relating to public affairs, why must Stesichorus's apologue at Himera prove him *one of the greatest men in Sicily?* The Arundel Marble gives us a date when Stesichorus the poet *εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφίκετο, went into Greece.* Now, *εἰς Ἑλλάδα ἀφικέσθαι* means to travel into Greece to get money, *as his brother poets did, who were to make their fortunes by their pen.* When Homer was very poor, says Herodotus,[g] some persuaded him *εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀπικέσθαι, to go into Greece;* and he designed it, but died in Ios before he began the voyage. And the readers will be apt to suspect, for all the *greatness* that Mr. B. dreams of, that Stesichorus had no other errand to Greece than Homer had before him, and Simonides and others after him.

I had made another censure upon the *Epistles, for calling the same copy of verses both μέλος and ἐλεγεῖον.* The Examiner replies, *that, by the different cast of his head, he should have reasoned just the other way, and have inferred something in favour of the* Letters. *First,* he says, *a Sophist would not have confounded the words* (p. 106, 107). True: a learned Sophist would not have writ such sorry epistles, as a judicious man would not have published them; but our mock Phalaris is a Sophist of that size that no kind of blunder is below his character. But *a prince,* says Mr. B., *might not think himself obliged to write with all the exactness of a scholar.* This is just the second part of his compliment

[e] Arist. Rhet. ii. 2.
[f] Livy, ii.
[g] Herod. Vitâ Homeri.

to Queen Elizabeth:[h] he's resolved, it seems, to stand up for *princes*, and maintain for them a royal prerogative of speaking improperly. But let Mr. B. be as good a courtier as he pleases; I am now to consider him only in his capacity of a critic. I shall proceed, therefore, to his next remark, *that Phalaris called it an ἐλεγεῖον when he asked it of Stesichorus, and knew not what measure it would be in; but when he had it, and saw it was* lyric, *he then called it μέλος* (p. 107). Who can deny, now, but this is sharply observed? but there's one inconvenience in't, that, while he's careful of the *prince's* reputation, he betrays the poet's. For if an *elegy*, in the proper sense of the word (as this excuse supposes), was bespoken of Stesichorus, why should he make a *lyric* poem instead on't? This had been just like the sign-painter, that, whatsoever was bespoken of him, whether a lion or a dolphin, always painted a rose. But Mr. B. will prove, *that ἔλεγος and ἐλεγεῖον had a looser sense than what the grammarians put upon them, because Dion Chrysostom calls heroic verses on Sardanapalus's tomb ἐλεγεῖον* (p. 107). But there's a figure of rhetoric here, called *self-contradiction*, that's very frequent in our Examiner's reasonings. For he had newly said, *a Sophist could not mistake ἐλεγεῖον, the distinct sense of which was so well settled before his time by the grammarians* (p. 106.): and now he produces Dion Chrysostom, (who, as he tells us, was *as errant a Sophist and declaimer as ever was*) (p. 26.), *employing it in a looser meaning than what the grammarians put upon't*. But, to let this pass; what he teaches us here about *the distinct sense that the grammarians settled upon't*, is but a cast of his *own loose and unsettled* sense. For the grammarians knew well enough that ἐλεγεῖον was taken for *epitaph*, even without a pentameter in't. They could learn that out of Herodotus, among others, when he tells 'em, *that the people of Ios τὸ ἐλεγεῖον τόδε ἐπέγραψαν, wrote this elegy on Homer's tomb*:[i]

[h] See here, vol. i. p. 272.

[i] Herod. Vitâ Homeri.

Ἐνθάδε τὴν ἱερὴν κεφαλὴν κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτει
Ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων κοσμήτορα δῖον Ὅμηρον.*

And Suidas,[j] one of those grammarians, could not be ignorant of this; for he cites the very same epitaph, and calls it ἐλεγεῖον. The case is no more than this: in the old times they generally made their epitaphs in a single distich, hexameter and pentameter; whence in process of time an epitaph at large came to be called ἐλεγεῖον. *The ancients*, says the Scholiast upon Apollonius Rhodius,[k] *used* ἐλεγεῖα *for inscriptions upon tombs. Τὰ* ἐλεγεῖα, says Lycurgus the orator,[l] *τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις*. But what advantage is this now to Mr. B. and his Phalaris? An ἐλεγεῖον of all hexameters is as remote from a *lyric song* as if it was mixed with pentameters. So that ἐλεγεῖον and μέλος cannot yet be used for the same copy of verses, but by that privilege of making solecisms that Mr. B. would vindicate to *princes*.

But his next proof perhaps may be better: *for a nightingale*, he says, *in Aristophanes's* Aves *is said to sing* ἔλεγοι, *and by and by those very* ἔλεγοι *are called* μέλη (p. 107, 108). This indeed carries both surprise and demonstration along with it. What a strange reach of fancy has our Examiner! Who but he could ever have thought on this pretty argument from a nightingale? Let us put it into a syllogism: *a nightingale sings* μέλη, *a nightingale sings* ἔλεγοι, ergo μέλη *and* ἔλεγοι *are the same*. Very quaint indeed, and out of the common way! but it has one little fault, that if a nightingale can sing more tunes than one, his syllogism must then be hushed. Mr. B. seems to bring this argument with a very serious air; as if, because the poet metaphorically calls the singing of a bird by the several names of human music, we may infer that all those names may signify one

[* Eds. of *Hom. Vita* θεῖον.—D.]

[j] Suid. v. Ὅμηρος.

[k] Schol. Apollonii, ii. 784. [782.—D.] Τοῖς ἐλεγείοις ἐν τοῖς ἐπιταφίοις ἐχρῶντο οἱ παλαιοί.

[l] Lycurg. p. 168.

and the same thing. But, in the very same page, Aristophanes says that the upupa, which we call *the hoopoe*, no very melodious bird, chanted a μέλος;

Ὄυποψ μελῳδεῖν αὖ παρασκευάζεται.[m]

Mr. B. therefore, by the very same reasoning, may give us another syllogism: *the nightingale sings a* μέλος, *the hoopoe sings a* μέλος, ergo *the hoopoe sings like the nightingale.* And, by the same argument, blackbirds will sing like them, for their notes too are μέλη;

Κόσσυφοι ἀχεῦσιν ποικιλότραυλα μέλη.[n]

And so the *cicada* too;

Ξουθὰν ἐκ πτερύγων ἀδὺ κρέκουσα μέλος.[o]

Nay, the very frogs will croak like nightingales;

Ταῖς νύμφαισι δ' ἔδοξεν ἀεὶ τὸν βάτραχον ᾄδειν.
Τῷ δ' ἐγὼ οὐ φθονέοιμι, τὸ γὰρ μέλος οὐ καλὸν ᾄδει.[p]

But, what is still more extraordinary, the same nightingale in Aristophanes a little after begins to chant a lesson of *anapæsts;*

Ὕμνων σύντροφ' ἀηδοῖ,
. . . . . .
Ἄρχου τῶν ἀναπαίστων.[q]

So that, by Mr. B.'s powerful argument, both μέλη and ἔλεγοι and ἀνάπαιστοι may be all used in the same signification. And if Mr. B. had but produced some *anapæsts* of

[m] Aristoph. p. 376. [*Av.* v. 226. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[n] Anthol. i. 20. [*Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 195.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* II. 155.—*Poët. Min. Gr. ed. Gaisf.* II. 225.—The epigram is by Theocritus.—D.]

[o] Ibid. iii. 24. [*Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) I. 125.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* I. 361.—The epigram is by Mnasalcas.—D.]

[p] Moschus, Id. iii. [v. 113.—D.]

[q] Aristoph. p. 395. [*Av.* v. 679, 684. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

nightingales, to confute my observation about the measures of that verse,[r] they might have done him, perhaps, much better service than those of Æschylus and Seneca.

I had declared, that I suspected all to be a cheat about the friendship between Phalaris and Stesichorus, because the poet himself never mentioned it, nor any other writer, though several, had it been true, had fair occasion to speak of it. Now, the Examiner accounts for Lucian's silence, because he had said enough in naming Pythagoras; and to have added Stesichorus's name *would have made the piece look stiff and unnatural* (p. 109). Wonderfully nice and exact: he can tell you, to a single word, when a treatise will be stiff; like the gardener that could determine to a minute when his melons were ripe. *How many have I saved*, says Phalaris in Lucian, *who plotted against me, and were convicted; as Acanthus that stands here, and Timocrates, and Leogoras his brother?*[s] Now, according to the *Letters*, Stesichorus too was taken plotting, and yet the Tyrant saved his life, and made him his friend. But, says Mr. B., if Lucian here had added Stesichorus to the other three, that single name would have made the discourse as stiff as any buckram. And yet, allowing that Lucian himself had as nice a sensation of stiffness as Mr. B. appears to have, and therefore would not put down four names, but three only, yet methinks he might have spared one of those three, and put Stesichorus in his room; unless Mr. B. will shew that Timocrates or Leogoras (whom nobody ever heard of) were as famous as Stesichorus, and their examples as memorable. But Mr. B. adds further, *that, if Lucian's silence be an exception to Stesichorus's acquaintance with Phalaris, it is to Abaris's too; which yet our critic has before,*[t] *for the sake of Aristotle and Jamblichus, been graciously pleased to allow*. Now, without the Examiner's telling us, we might guess *that he was not awake sometimes in his work* (p. 203.);

[r] See here, vol. i. p. 191, &c.

[s] Lucian I. Phal. p. 845.

[t] Dissert. p. 15. [See vol. i. p. 98.—D.]

for *surely the man that writ this must have been fast asleep, or else he could never have talked so wildly* (p. 137). There is not one word in that place that his margin refers to about Phalaris's friendship with Abaris. And how could *I allow it for the sake of Aristotle*, who says not the least syllable of it? or if I should allow it for the sake of Jamblichus, what would that be to Lucian? For, according to Jamblichus, the Tyrant was killed by Abaris's means upon their first acquaintance; how then could Phalaris in Lucian have magnified himself to the Delphians upon the past friendship of that Hyperborean? If Lucian had believed the story as Jamblichus tells it, that the Tyrant was deposed by Pythagoras and Abaris at their first visit, his mentioning Abaris or Pythagoras in Phalaris's speech at Delphi had been very absurd. But Stesichorus had been a proper instance, if the *Letters* be true; for he was XII. years the Tyrant's friend, and died too before him. So that Lucian's not mentioning him shews he knew nothing of the *Epistles;* as, on the contrary, his mentioning Pythagoras shews he knew nothing of that story of his deposing Phalaris.

In the next place, Mr. B. accounts for Plato's silence about the friendship of Stesichorus and Phalaris, *because Plato mentions nothing there of the acquaintance between Pythagoras and Phalaris* (p. 109). An admirable account indeed! Plato, says Mr. B., might omit the mention of Stesichorus's friendship with Phalaris, and yet might believe it true, because he mentions not another friendship that, in all probability, is as mere a fiction as that. Which is just* as if he reasoned thus: the ancients, in their accounts of Æsop, say nothing of his ugliness, and yet they might believe it, because they say nothing neither of Xanthus the philosopher, with his company of scholastics.[u] But, says Mr. B., *the Pythagoreans all agree that their master and Phalaris were acquainted, and Dr. B. grants it.* I granted they were *contemporaries;* and, by a familiar slight of hand,[v]

[* Old ed. "a just."—D.]

[u] Planud. V. Æsop.

[v] See here, vol. i. p. 99.

he turns the word into *acquaintance*, as he once did before. But how knows he that *all the Pythagoreans agree*, when the only men that speak a word of it are Lucian and Jamblichus, and they were neither of them Pythagoreans? or suppose the Pythagorean story true as Jamblichus reports it,[w] *that Phalaris blasphemed the gods, despised philosophy, and designed to murder Pythagoras;* would this have been as proper and domestic an instance for Plato as the XII. years' friendship with Stesichorus? What *a master of decency* is Mr. B., and what *a relish* has he of *dexterous management*, who goes about to *excuse* Plato for not numbering Phalaris's and Pythagoras's *enmity* (for so it's represented by those Pythagoreans he speaks of,) among the *celebrated friendships* of learned men with tyrants?

As for the argument from the silence of Pindar, *he will not attempt to answer it;* which is a better sign of discretion than he usually shews. However, *he'll put me in mind of one false colour that I have given to my argument;* for I said, *Pindar exhorts Hiero to be kind to poets and men of letters:* but, says he, *there's not a word of that in the verses themselves, whatever guess the Scholiast may make at their remote meaning. So that the Doctor might as well prove his point from* Ἄριστον μὲν ὕδωρ (p. 110, 111). What shall we say now to such a hardy writer as this is, who can deny, with such an air of confidence, what every body's eyes can witness to be true? The very words of Pindar immediately preceding the passage I cited are,

Καὶ λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς,*

which, by the nicest translation, means *men of letters and poets.* And *to be kind to such,* the poet exhorts Hiero in the paragraph just before;

Εὐανθεῖ δ' ἐν ὀργᾷ παρμένων,
Εἴπερ τι φιλεῖς ἀκοὰν ἀδεῖαν ἀ-
εὶ κλύειν, μὴ κάμνε λίαν δαπάναις·

[w] Jambl. V. Pythag. p. 184.

[* *Pyth.* I. 183. *ed. Heyn.*—D.]

that is, *continue your generous temper, and, if you desire immortal fame, do not be weary of being bountiful.*

After he has denied that to be in Pindar which is evidently and expressly there, the next and last advance he makes is, to deny that to be in the *Letters* which he himself once knew to be there, if it was he that translated them. *The* Letters, he says, *do not imply that there was any extraordinary dearness between Stesichorus and Phalaris; there's no proof from them that Stesichorus loved him; his friendship was desired, and he only out of prudence did not stand off* (p. 111). This is spoken with a good measure of assurance; let us see with what measure of truth. The Tyrant declares, *that, though he gave Stesichorus* XII. *years of life, yet still he was in debt to him; for he alone of all mortals gave him courage, and taught him to despise death:*[x] and that, *for the sake of Stesichorus, he's ready to encounter certain destruction.*[y] And the fame of Phalaris's kindness to him was so great, that the Tauromenites applied to Stesichorus to intercede with the Tyrant, that he would remit the price of their captives.[z] Stesichorus dies before he could do it for them; but he leaves it in command to his daughters to ask that favour in his name. The Tyrant, upon the first notice of the request, immediately returns the money, with this protestation, *that he would not only do that for his sake, ἀλλ' εἰ καί τι καὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἐστὶ μεῖζον, but any thing else, though 'twere more than impossible.* And yet it appears, from another Letter,[a] that the sum he remitted here was no less than a hundred talents, or 18,000 pound[s] sterling, the greatest sum by much that appears in the whole set of *Epistles*, and six times as much as in another Letter[b] he was forced to borrow for himself. This, I presume, is a pretty good token of an *extraordinary dearness* on Phalaris's side; and this alone would be argument enough to prove Stesichorus was not insensible on his part; for Mr. B.

[x] Ep. 103. [y] 54. [z] 31.
[a] 85. [b] 116.

surely will not make such a ninny of his *Sicilian prince*, as to suppose him so prodigal of his highest favours, without suitable returns of friendship. But, besides this, the very *Letters* are as express for Stesichorus's love as for Phalaris's. For, as the Tauromenites addressed to Stesichorus to obtain favours of the Tyrant, so Pelopidas[c] and Nicocles[d] apply themselves to the Tyrant to get favours of Stesichorus, which in his way were copies of verses. And the argument that Phalaris uses to persuade the poet to do that favour, is, *to confirm the received opinion that the world had of their friendship*.[e] And he tells us both there and once more,[f] that Stesichorus desired leave to celebrate him in his poems. But the Tyrant begs he would not do it, πρὸς ἑταιρείου Διὸς, καὶ κοινῆς ἑστίας,* by such obtestations as are used among the dearest friends and relations. *And it's sufficient*, he says, *for him to be written* ἐν αὐτῷ Στησιχόρῳ,† *in Stesichorus's own heart*. Now, if these do not imply a friendship on Stesichorus's part as well as Phalaris's, let the reader be judge; and at the same time let him reflect, what an odd-sighted Examiner I have to deal with, that at some times can see in books what never was there, but at other times cannot see the plainest things, not only in other men's books, but even in his own.

XVI.

It must needs be a great wonder, to those that think the *Letters* genuine, how or where they were concealed, in what secret cave, or unknown corner of the world; so that nobody ever heard of them for a thousand years together. Some trusty servant of the Tyrant must have buried them under ground; and it was well that he did so. For if the Agrigentines had met with them, they had certainly gone to

[c] 65. [d] 78. [e] 78. [f] 146.

[* 79. *ed.* Oxon.—D.] [† *Ibid.*—D.]

pot.* They that burned alive both him, and his relations, and his friends, would never have spared such monuments of him to survive them and their city. And without doubt it was immortal vellum, and stolen from the *parchments of Jove*,[g] that could last for ten ages, though untouched and unstirred, in spite of all damp and moisture, that moulders other mortal skins. For, had our *Letters* been used or transcribed during that thousand years, somebody would surely have spoken of them: especially since so many of the ancients had occasion to do so; so that their silence is a direct argument that they never had heard of them. I have just now cited some passages of Pindar, Plato, and Lucian, which are a plain indication that they were unknown to those three. Nay, the last of these, besides the proof above named from his silence and pretermission, does as good as declare expressly that he never saw our *Epistles*. For, not to mention other differences of less moment, he makes both Phalaris[h] and his smith Perilaus to be born at Agrigentum; but the *Letters* bring one of them from Astypalæa, and the other from Athens. Lucian, then, knew nothing of them, or at least knew them, as I do, to be spurious, and below his notice. Much less could he be the author of them, as Politian and his followers believe; for he would neither have been guilty of such flat contradictions, nor have so forfeited all learning and wit, by those gross blunders in

[* Lennep translates this passage: "Si enim eas invenissent Agrigentini, "sine dubio tergendis natibus inserviissent."—D.]

[g] Διφθέραι Διός. [See Valckenaer's note on Herod. p. 400. *ed. Wessel.*, and *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 184, sq.—D.]

[h] Phalar. i. Ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ τῶν ἀφανῶν ἐν Ἀκράγαντι ὤν. and ibid. Περίλαος ἦν τις ἠμεδαπός.

chronology, and that wretched pedantry in the matter. And whosoever those authors were that Lucian followed in his narrative of Phalaris, they too are so many witnesses against the *Epistles*. One can hardly believe, indeed, that the Sophist should venture to fetch his Tyrant from Astypalæa without the warrant of some old writer. But yet Lucian and other authors compel us to think so. And we find him as foolhardy on other occasions. Heraclides of Pontus,[i] that lived within two centuries of Phalaris's age, says, the Agrigentines, when they recovered their liberty, burned him and his mother; but our Sophist makes him an orphan, ὀρφανίας πειραθῆναι,[j] which if any one shall contend to mean the loss of his father only, yet still he and Heraclides will not set horses together. For if Phalaris fled alone from Astypalæa, neither wife nor child nor any relation following him, according to the *Letters*, how came the old woman to be roasted at Agrigentum? So little regard had the Sophist to fit his stories to true history; and I have had too much regard to him, in giving him the honour and patience of so long an examination.

The Examiner, as if he designed to make some amends for his former tedious trifling, will give us very little trouble upon this last article. He would only parallel the thousand years that Phalaris's *Epistles* lay in obscurity with some examples of other genuine books that had the same fortune (p. 113, 114). Velleius Paterculus, he says, is not quoted till Priscian's time, 500 years after he wrote; and then we hear no more of him till Aventinus's time, 900 years after Priscian. So, Phædrus is first mentioned by Avienus (400

[i] De Polit. Κρεσφοντες δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

[j] Epist. xlix.

years after the author's time), and by none after him till Pithœus brought him to light. And Lactantius *De Mortibus Persecutorum* was not seen, since St. Jerome's time, till, after a thousand years, Baluzius published it. But the gentleman is out in his last instance; for Lactantius's book is mentioned by Freculphus, an author of the IXth century, and by Honorius Augustodunensis in the XIIth, as the very editions of Lactantius might have informed him. But, to pass that over, what are all these examples in comparison of Phalaris's case? Paterculus's book was owned within 500 years, Phædrus's within 400, and Lactantius's within 100; and, if they were not mentioned from those times till the restoration of learning, the reason is apparent, because the Western world in that interval of time was so wretchedly ignorant and immersed in barbarity, that such books as those were not read; or if they were read, the readers of them were not writers themselves, so as to let posterity know that they read them. So that the case of these three authors is common with most of the rest; for there are several others of the ancient books, which we now have, and acknowledge for genuine, that are not mentioned by the writers of those barbarous ages. But the fortune of Phalaris's *Epistles* runs counter to all this: the thousand years that followed that Tyrant's age was the greatest and longest reign of learning that the world has yet seen, or perhaps ever will; and in all that time these *Epistles* were never once heard of; but they first came into notice when learning was decaying, in the very dusk and twilight before the long night of ignorance. Neither were they mentioned at 100, or 400, or 500 years after the date of them, and then forgot for some centuries, (as it happened in Mr. B.'s instances,) but they were never seen for the first thousand years after their pretended writing; and when they once appeared, they continued always in use. A man must have a very singular *cast of his head* (p. 106.), that can think these cases to be parallel. But the greatest difference is yet behind; for, though the writers of the barbarous ages do not speak of

Paterculus, nor Phædrus, nor Lactantius; yet they do not tell us any thing that implies there were no such books in being. If they say any thing amiss, that they might have corrected out of those authors, 'tis to be imputed to their own ignorance or laziness, that they would not search into them, and cannot pass for a negative proof that there were no such authors. But the writers for the first ten ages after Phalaris being men very inquisitive, and of universal learning, and acquainted with all sorts of books, some of them must needs have met with the *Epistles* in all that time, if the book had been above ground; and yet they tell us several particulars relating to Phalaris, which of necessity imply that they never had seen the *Letters*.

As, besides the passages that I have already produced, there was a controversy in those ages about Phalaris's Bull: for Timæus, the famous Sicilian historian, who wrote about Olymp. CXXVIII., said the whole story of the Bull was a mere fiction, though it had been so much talked of by historians, as well as poets. *Τίμαιός φησι .... μήτε γεγονέναι τοιοῦτον (ταῦρον) ἐν τῇ προειρημένῃ πόλει (Ἀκράγαντι)*, says Polybius:[k] *Τοῦτον τὸν ταῦρον ὁ Τίμαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις διαβεβαιωσάμενος μὴ γεγονέναι τὸ σύνολον*, says Diodorus.[l] This I suppose is a plain argument, that, in the age of Timæus (who was a native of Sicily, and the son of Andromachus the founder and governor of Taurominium, and wrote his histories at Athens,[m]) the *Epistles* were neither known in Sicily, where they are supposed to be writ, nor at Athens, the common academy of learned and curious men. For if Timæus had heard of these *Letters*, how durst he have called in question the common tradition about the Bull, since these *Letters*, if they be genuine, are such an authentic and demonstrative proof of it? Well, but Polybius and Diodorus endeavour to refute Timæus, and to prove that there was really such a Bull. And pray, how

[k] Polyb. Excerpta, p. 58. [where *Τίμαιος ... φάσκων ... μήτε, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]
[l] Diod. p. 210. [m] Plutarch. de Exilio.

do they go about it? Do they appeal to the Tyrant's own *Letters?* the most certain and easy way of conviction, if such *Letters* were then in the world. Nothing like it; but the sole argument that they go upon is a Brazen Bull that Scipio found in Carthage, with a door in the side of it, which was therefore supposed to have been Phalaris's Bull, and to have been carried to Carthage, Ol. XCIII. 3., among the spoils of Agrigentum. But, could either of them have omitted to mention the Tyrant's *Letters*, if ever they had met with them? and yet the one of them was a Sicilian born, and both of them great travellers and great scholars. The *Epistles*, therefore, were not heard of in Polybius's time, CXX. years after Timæus, nor in Diodorus's time, CXX. years after Polybius. I am aware that the Scholiast of Pindar represents Timæus's narrative quite another way; for he tells us, as from that historian, *that the Agrigentines cast Phalaris's Bull into the sea; and that the Bull in Agrigentum, which in his time was shewn for Phalaris's, was only a statue of the river Gelon.*[n] So that, by this account, Timæus did not deny that the Tyrant had a Brazen Bull, but only censured the mistake of those that took a statue of a river for it; for rivers were often represented *ταυρόμορφοι*, in the shape of bulls.[o] And if any one pleases to give credit to this Scholiast before Polybius and Diodorus, this passage of Timæus will have no force against the *Epistles*. But I suppose there will not be many of that mind; or if all should be so, yet the authorities of Polybius and Diodorus are still as strong against the *Epistles* for their two ages as if they were believed in their account of Timæus. For, since it's evident and undeniable that they both supposed Timæus had denied the whole story of Phalaris's Bull, they would as certainly appeal to the *Epistles*, upon the supposition that Timæus denied it, as if he really had denied it.

Another instance, which seems plainly to imply that the

[n] Schol. Pind. Pyth. i.

[o] Ælian. Var. Hist. ii. 33.

Epistles of Phalaris were not extant in those ages, is a tradition that he ate his own son. Aristotle, among other examples of eaters of human flesh, reckons *τὸ περὶ Φάλαριν λεγόμενον, the report about Phalaris.*[p] What that report was, the philosopher does not say expressly; but perhaps we may be informed by his scholar Clearchus, who, in his book *Of Lives*, says, *Phalaris the Tyrant came to that degree of cruelty and immanity, that he devoured sucking children.*[q] And from him perhaps Tatian might have it, where he tells us, *that Phalaris used to take infants from the mothers' breasts, and eat them.*[r] But this can hardly pass for Aristotle's meaning; because he says there, that some of the savage nations about the Euxine were eaters of children, and yet he makes Phalaris's inhumanity to be different from theirs. He seems to explain himself presently after, where he says, *Φάλαρις . . . . ἐπιθυμῶν παιδίου φαγεῖν, Phalaris longing to eat a child;* but his paraphrast Andronicus Rhodius (as he's commonly supposed to be) says it was Phalaris's own son that Aristotle makes him eat: *Ὁ Φάλαρις ἐποίησε φαγὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα*: and so Aspasius the Scholiast, *Ὁ Φάλαρις λέγεται φαγεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα, Phalaris is reported to have eaten his own son.*[s] It appears, I suppose, sufficiently from these several authors, that there was a prevailing tradition about Phalaris's eating his own son when he was an infant; and that alone will effectually prove that in those ages they had never heard of the Tyrant's *Epistles.* For we have five there to his son Paurolas, and two to his wife Erythia, about his son's education; by all which it appears that he was a very fond father, that his son was then grown a man, and that he was his *only son.*[t] How then could he eat his own son while he was an infant, according to that tradition? or, how is't possible that such

[p] Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. vii. 5. Eudem. vi. 5.

[q] Athen. p. 396. [=III. 466. *ed. Schw.*—D.] *Γαλαθηνὰ θοινᾶσθαι βρέφη.*

[r] Tatian. sect. 54. Ὁ [ὃς] *τοὺς ἐπιμαστιδίους θοινώμενος παῖδας.*

[s] Aspasius ad Aristot. p. 154.

[t] Ep. 18. *Ὡς πατὴρ ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς υἱοῦ φοβούμενος.*

a story could obtain in the world, if the authentic *Letters* of the father could be produced to disprove it?

I had observed, that Lucian, in his two tracts about Phalaris, where he supposes the Tyrant to have sent the Brazen Bull to Delphi as a donary to Apollo, and endeavours to persuade the Delphians to accept of it, has several particulars that contradict the *Epistles;* which is an argument that he either had never heard of them, or believed them to be a cheat. Mr. B. endeavours to answer this, by producing my own words, *that Lucian* FEIGNS *an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi: so that if the whole,* says he, *be a fiction, how can we argue from it seriously?* (p. 115.) But, if Mr. B. himself argue *seriously* here, he discovers no extraordinary judgment. For the whole story may be *feigned* by Lucian, and yet the several parts of it may and ought to be agreeable to truth.

Ψευδοίμην ἀΐοντος ἅ κεν πεπίθοιεν ἀκουήν.

If I tell lies, says Callimachus, *I would tell such as are probable and plausible.** Ovid's *Epistles of the Heroines* are all fictions of his own; but yet the subject and ground of them is taken from ancient history; he does not confound countries and ages together. So, Lucian's *Dialogues of the Dead* are nothing but romances; but he takes care to represent the true history and character of each person; he does not make Crœsus a cynic philosopher, nor Diogenes a king. By the same reason, if Lucian had seen and believed these *Epistles,* he would not call Phalaris an Agrigentine, whom they declare an Astypalæan; nor Perilaus a Sicilian, whom they represent as an Athenian; nor have mentioned such obscure names as Acanthus, Timocrates, and Leogoras, for examples of the Tyrant's clemency, when the *Letters* themselves would have furnished him with such an illustrious instance of it in the story of Stesichorus.

But Mr. B. is pleased to say further, that Lucian's

[* *H. in Jov.* 65. But see Blomfield ad l.—D.]

differing from the *Epistles* either proves nothing against them, or proves too much; *even that Lucian never saw Timæus, as learned as he was, and as often as he mentions him. For Timæus relates, that the Agrigentines threw the Bull into the sea, but Lucian says Phalaris sent it to Delphos* (p. 115). Now, I'm afraid he that *consulted books* for the Examiner has deceived him here; for I do not remember that Lucian ever quotes Timæus's writings, much less *mentions him so often* as Mr. B. here pretends. He names him indeed once in his *Macrobii, that he lived* XCVI. *years;* but he could hardly have that from Timæus himself, but from the accounts of others. But, however, I'll allow Mr. B. that Lucian had read Timæus; but I cannot by no means allow him, that this argument of mine must, if it prove any thing at all, *prove that Lucian never saw Timæus.* That is such an inference as I could hardly have believed a man that has dealt so much in logic could possibly be guilty of. For it's evident that if Lucian had seen and approved the *Epistles,* he would never have departed from them in his account of Phalaris's country, for the *Letters* had been an authority above all exception. But the case is very different with Timæus, who wrote his histories CCXL. years after Phalaris's death. Lucian might have read those often enough, without giving as much credit to them as to Phalaris's own *Letters.* Nay, it's plain he might have read this very account that Timæus has given of Phalaris's Bull, and yet might purposely contradict it. For he might read in Polybius and Diodorus, whose passages we have cited above, that the very Bull was found at Carthage, and restored to the Agrigentines by Scipio's order; and so think Timæus to be both ways mistaken, whether he denied, as those two historians say, that there ever was such a Bull; or affirmed, as the Scholiast of Pindar says, that the Bull was sunk in the sea. So very weak and absurd is Mr. B.'s inference, that, if Lucian has receded from Timæus's account, he might as well depart from the *Epistles* themselves, though he looked upon them as genuine. But, besides all this,

there is no contradiction at all between Lucian and Timæus: so that the very ground that Mr. B. reasons from is as fallacious as his way of reasoning. For Lucian says no more than this, that the Tyrant sent the Bull for a present to Delphi; and the Delphians demurring whether they should accept it or no, he makes two orations in Phalaris's name, to persuade them to receive it: but that they really received it, there is not a word said. Nay, one may rather infer, from the custom of Lucian and other Sophists to choose the ἥττω λόγον, the weaker and paradoxical side of a dispute, that there was some tradition that the Bull was sent to Delphi, and rejected by the priests there. It might be returned therefore to Agrigentum, and afterwards be either thrown into the sea, according to Timæus, or carried to Carthage, according to Polybius and Diodorus.

In the next attempt, Mr. B. would reconcile the *Epistles* with Jamblichus's story about Abaris's conversation with the *Sicilian prince*. In the former Edition of my *Dissertation* I had allowed that story a place among the historical accounts of Phalaris, though even then I believed it a mere romance of Jamblichus's, but I had no room nor occasion to examine and refute it. But in this second Edition, where the exceptions of the Examiner has [have] made it necessary to inquire into all those particulars, I have freely declared, and, as I humbly conceive, have fully made out my opinion, that there's no credit to be given to that story about Abaris.[u]

To go on, then, to the following paragraph, where he endeavours to make Heraclides agree with the *Epistles*. He takes hold of a small handle I had given him, that the ὀρφανία of Phalaris may possibly mean *the loss of his father only*, not the loss of *both parents* (p. 117). But then he ought to have retracted his own translation of Phalaris, for there he renders it, *à primâ infantiâ* PARENTIBUS *fuisse orbatum*.[v] But perhaps, as he says, *he did not remember any such Epistle in his Edition of Phalaris;* and indeed he seems,

[u] See here, vol. i. p. 114, 115, 116.

[v] Phal. Ep. 49.

by the frequent contradictions he makes to that Edition, to have quite forgot that he ever set it out; though some have been so free as to make a question, whether that proceeds from the badness or the goodness of his memory. But that is no question with me: the question here, that I am concerned in, is, *whether it may be gathered from the* Epistles, *that Phalaris's mother did not follow him to Agrigentum.* Now, the reasons why I think that she did not are these. First, the Tyrant tells us that he was an *orphan in his childhood,*[w] which is likely to signify, that his mother was then dead: then he tells us, in several Epistles, that he was forced to leave his wife and only son behind him; which is a shrewd sign that the mother too, if alive, was left with them. Besides this, there is not one word in all the *Epistles* relating to the old gentlewoman, which Mr. B. will confess a man of Phalaris's *benevolence and affection to his family*[x] could hardly have omitted; and in the letters to his son there's no mention made either of the young man's duty to his grandmother, or of her love to him; and so, in the letters to his wife there's as great a silence about the mother's kindness to her daughter-in-law. Now, it can hardly be supposed, that, in familiar epistles, as these are, and never intended for the public, the mother should be quite forgot when he writes to his son and his wife. In the XIVth book of Tully's *Epistles,* which are written to his family, we have his wife Terentia, his daughter Tullia, and his son Cicero, all that were then alive, mentioned in every page; and if his aged father or mother had lived then, without question scarce a letter would have 'scaped him without some testimony of his duty and affection to them. If Mr. B., therefore, will not take it ill, that we compare a *Roman senator's* Epistles to his *Sicilian prince's,* we may fairly infer, from the comparison, that Phalaris's mother was dead before the date of these *Letters;* and consequently that Heraclides contradicts them, where he says that the old

[w] Ep. 49. [x] Index. Phalar.

woman was burned in the Bull, when her son was deposed.

Mr. B. has two exceptions still behind, which must briefly be considered. He denies *that his copy of Heraclides says Phalaris was burned in his Bull* (p. 117.): but I have answered this already,[y] and no more needs to be said to't. Then he tells us, *that his copy of Phalaris has no such Epistle as implies that the Tyrant fled alone from Astypalæa; but, if there should be such an one in the King's MS., he'll answer this objection when the Library-keeper is in so good an humour as to favour him with a sight of it.* Now, in my opinion, Mr. B.'s own Edition of Phalaris sufficiently implies it, as I think I have newly proved. But there is no epistle in the King's MS. but what is extant in the common copies; on the contrary, there are several wanting. And if Mr. B. pleases to make trial of my *good humour*, either for a sight of that MS. or of any thing else in my power, he may then represent me to the world upon his own knowledge, and not upon the reports of those that think to ingratiate with him by calumniating me, though they never knew me any more than he does.

I have now gone through all the gentleman's exceptions to my *Dissertation* about Phalaris's *Epistles;* and, that I may oblige him at parting, I will help him to a rare expedient, that will give a clear and plausible account why the Tyrant's *Epistles* were not known for about 1000 years after his death. It appears, by the XXXIVth Letter, that he began to be very apprehensive of some conspiracies against him: 'tis very probable, therefore, that he would provide against a sudden stroke, and secure such things as he esteemed most valuable. And, because all other monuments besides letters are short-lived and perishing, he must needs have a particular regard to his *Epistles*, those monuments of his wit and learning and virtues, which might do him right to posterity,

[y] See here, vol. i. p. 241.

against the calumnies of popular hatred. We may suppose, then, that he would put these his precious remains into a chest of cedar or cypress, secured against moisture with pitch and other bituminous substances, and so bury it in the earth in a case of marble, where it might remain for a thousand years, till at last it was fortunately dug up, though the manner and circumstances of the discovery of it are now quite extinct. We have a famous instance like this of our *Sicilian prince* in the story of Numa the Roman prince. Numa ordered some writings to be put up safely in a coffin of stone, and to be privately buried with him;[z] and they happened to be dug up A. U. C. DLXXII., when they had lain in the ground CCCCXC. years. Here are very good witnesses of this matter of fact, Cassius Hemina, Lucius Piso, Valerius Antias, all Roman historians of great antiquity and reputation. 'Tis true, indeed, that Numa's books are not now to be had, for they were burned by order of the magistrate, because they contained something that was dangerous to the public religion. But, however, the story, we see, has three substantial vouchers; and if the years that these books continued under ground do not reach to the number that Phalaris's lay buried, we must consider what Livy tells us from the historians named above, *that the writings were not only entire, but looked as fresh as if they were newly writ.*[a] If they lasted, then, near 500 years, with all the freshness of a new book, we may reasonably suppose they would have been legible still, had they lain 500 years longer. Now, to use the words of Mr. B., *what is there in this story* about Phalaris's burying his Letters *either absurd or unnatural* (p. 100.)? what was really done at Rome, may be fairly presumed to have been done too in Sicily. Nay, further, as he judiciously observes, *this supposition must be shewn* IMPOSSIBLE, *before any convincing argument can be drawn* from the silence of all the ancients *to prove these*

[z] Liv. lib. xl. Pliny, xiii. 13. Plut. Numâ. Lactantius, i. 22.
[a] Liv. xl. Non integros modò, sed recentissimâ specie.

Letters *spurious* (p. 89). And if once he can bring his matters to that point, he can lie so intrenched there, that he may hold out for his Phalaris as long as Troy did against the Greeks.

Nay, to leave the gentleman still in better humour, I'll oblige him with a further remark, and shew how all the objections against the *Letters* may be evaded by his single supposition, that they were buried under ground. For, as the lives of the greatest heroes have been attended with such extraordinary events as seem to be either miraculous or incredible, so the writings that have had the singular fortune of lying some ages under ground have all of them had some remarkable qualities that cannot be found in vulgar books. As the writings of Numa, for instance, were II. Latin books and II. Greek books;[b] and yet they were VII. Latin and VII. Greek;[c] nay, they were XII. Latin and XII. Greek.[d] Now, for the same things to be II., VII., and XII., is no ordinary case, but a peculiar property of buried writings. Again, those Greek writings of Numa's were a system of the Pythagorical philosophy;[e] and yet we know that Pythagoras, the founder of that philosophy, lived IV. or V. generations after Numa's time. And again, the books of Numa were made of Egyptian *papyrus*, which was not applied to the use of writing till a good while after Numa was dead. But if Numa's books could consist of Egyptian paper, and contain the precepts of Pythagoras, so many generations before paper was made, or Pythagoras was born, what wonder is it if the *Epistles* of Phalaris, which we suppose now to have been buried like Numa's, should have the names of several towns and other things that were not built nor heard of till long after the Tyrant's death? So the famous Hetruscan monuments, that Curtius Inghiramius* dug up in Italy, after they had been buried some thousands of years, were written upon vulgar paper such as now is in use, and made of linen

[b] Pliny. [c] Livy. [d] Plut. [e] Pliny, Livy.

[* See note, vol. i. p. 84.—D.]

rags, a very recent invention; and, which is still the more wonderful, upon every sheet there was the cipher of the man that made it, who was either then alive, or newly dead, when the monuments were found. 'Tis the privilege, therefore, of buried books to have that prophetic quality of considering future things as if they were present; which will fully account for all the odd things in chronology that the *Letters* are taxed with. And then for the Attic dialect that Phalaris has used there, we have a salvo clear beyond Mr. B.'s project of *transdialecting*. For the *Revelation of St. James*, that was writ with the apostle's own hand, and lay buried in Spain from that time to the xvth century, had some parts of it in modern Spanish, which was not in being in the time of the apostle. Now, if the buried writings in Spain can use dialects that were no where spoken till many ages after the date of them, why might not the buried *Epistles* in Sicily use the new Attic dialect, though it was first formed and introduced some generations after the author's death? 'Tis true, the learned Aldrete[f] endeavours to account for the modern Spanish in the apostle's writings from the gift of prophecy that he was inspired with, by which he foreknew when his buried writings would be dug up, and therefore used the language that would then be in fashion. But he needed not to have recourse to any apostolical gift, if he had but considered that it's the general property of all such buried writings to speak proleptically, and to anticipate those things that are to happen in future ages: so Numa did, so the Hetruscan heroes of Inghiramius, and so the *Sicilian prince*.

XVII.

When I was to write my *Dissertation* upon Phalaris, at the request of my learned friend,* I read the *Epistles* over, and the passages that I remarked as I

[f] Bern. Aldrete, Varias Antiguedades de Espanna, Africa, y otras Provincias.

[* Wotton.—D.]

went along were the topics of that discourse. But having since been obliged, upon the account of Mr. B., to read the *Epistles* over again, I observed three or four places, that then had escaped me, which are as certain signs of an imposture as any I had produced before.

In the IIId Epistle the Sophist uses the word ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑ to express the notion of *God's providence, εἰς τὴν τοῦ δαιμονίου πρόνοιαν ἀναφέρων τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ.* And again, in the CIVth he threatens the Catanæans, *that he will never cease to be their enemy, ἕως ἂν ἡ διοικοῦσα πρόνοια τὴν αὐτὴν ἁρμονίαν τοῦ* ΚΟΣΜΟΥ *φυλάττῃ, as long as Providence sustains the frame of the world;* and he presently adds, *that they profaned the fire of Ætna, if the fire of that mountain, like the other elements of nature, had any thing of divinity in it;* Εἴγε *θείας τύχης,** says he, *ὥσπερ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς φύσεως* ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, *καὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν Αἴτνην πῦρ μεμοίραται.* Now, here are no fewer than three words, ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑ, ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, ΚΟΣΜΟΣ, that were never taken in those senses in the days of the true Phalaris. For Laërtius[g] acquaints us, out of the famous Phavorinus's VIIIth book Παντοδαπῆς Ἱστορίας, *Of Omnifarious History, that Plato first applied στοιχεῖον,* element, *to a philosophical sense, and first named πρόνοια the Providence of God;* Πρῶτος ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ . . . ὠνόμασε . . ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΟΝ *καὶ διαλεκτικὴν . . . . . καὶ θεοῦ* ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑΝ. So that *πρόνοια*† before Plato's time did not signify divine Providence, nor was ever ascribed to the Deity, but was used only to denote human consideration and

[* Lennep, in his ed. of *Phalar. Epist.*, reads ψυχῆς, p. 150., where see note. —D.]

[g Laërt. in Platone. [I. 180. *ed. Meib.*—D.]

[† But see the long note by Lennep on *Phalar. Epist.* p. 148.—D.]

forecast. And so στοιχεῖον seems to have meant nothing else but the letters of the alphabet, till Plato first applied it to signify the elements of natural bodies. Τὰ μὲν πρῶτα, says Plato,[h] οἱαπερεὶ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ, ἐξ ὧν ἡμεῖς τε συγκείμεθα καὶ τἄλλα, *the first elements, as it were, whereof men and all other things consist:* and in another place he says,[i] Τόνδε τὸν κόσμον, ζῶον ἔμψυχον ἔννουν τε, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσθαι ΠΡΟΝΟΙΑΝ, *the world, being an animal endued with soul and mind, was in reality made by the Providence of God.* Where Proclus, in his Commentary,[j] tells us, (Ὅτι) δεῖ μεμνῆσθαι, καὶ ὧν ὁ χερονεὺς εἶπε περὶ τῆς πρόνοιας ὀνόματος, ὡς Πλάτωνος οὕτω περὶ τὴν θείαν κελεύσαντος. For χερονεὺς we must read Χαιρωνεὺς, that is, Plutarch, who was born at Chæronea; and the latter part of the sentence may thus be corrected, ὡς Πλάτωνος οὕτω πρώτου θείαν καλέσαντος.* *We must remember,* says he, *what Plutarch says about the name of πρόνοια, that Plato was the first that applied the word to signify divine Providence.* There's little question to be made but that this is a true emendation; though whether Plutarch says this in any of his books that are now extant, I do not now remember. Well, since it appears from so good authority, who it was that first put these new significations upon πρόνοια and στοιχεῖον, we may justly pronounce that the *Epistles* are a cheat, since they have used the words in the Platonic sense, and yet pretend to bear date above a whole century before Plato.

[h] Plato in Sophistâ. [The passage occurs in the *Theætetus: Plat. Op.* III. 546. *ed.* 1826.—D.]

[i] Plato in Timæo. [*Plat. Op.* VII. 258. *ed.* 1826.—D.]

[j] Proclus in Plat. Timæum, p. 126.

[* Lennep corrects ὡς Πλάτ. οὕτω προμήθειαν (*vel* τὴν προμήθειαν) καλέσ.: note on *Phalar. Epist.* p. 142.—D.]

And now that I am speaking of πρόνοια, I cannot omit a very elegant saying of Hierocles the Stoic, which, as A. Gellius tells us,[k] the Platonic philosopher Taurus had always in his mouth when Epicurus was mentioned, Ἡδονὴ τέλος πόρνης δόγμα οὐκ ἔστιν πορνεῖα, οὐδὲν πόρνης δόγμα: which being manifestly corrupted, our most excellent Bishop Pearson[l] corrects it thus, Ἡδονὴ τέλος· πόρνης δόγμα. οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια οὐδέν· πόρνης δόγμα; i. e. *Pleasure is the* summum bonum: *a strumpet's tenet. Providence is nothing: a strumpet's tenet.* Now, the emendation, in the main, is true and good, for πορνεῖα is, with great sagacity, changed by him into πρόνοια, which is the basis of the whole sentence. But yet there's something harsh in the syntax that his lordship has made there, οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια οὐδέν: for the author, if he had used οὐδὲν, would have said, πρόνοια οὐδέν ἐστι. Besides that the same answer, πόρνης δόγμα, coming twice, makes the saying a little flat, and scarce worthy to be used by Taurus so frequently; nor is it true that all strumpets deny Providence. I am persuaded that the true reading is thus, Ἡδονὴ τέλος· πόρνης δόγμα. Οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια· οὐδὲ πόρνης δόγμα. Now it's impossible in our language to express this saying with the same brevity and turn that the original has; but the meaning of it is, *Pleasure is the* summum bonum: *a strumpet's tenet. There's no Providence: a tenet too bad even for a strumpet.*

In the passage already quoted from the *Letters* we had ἁρμονία τοῦ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ, *the harmony and frame of the* WORLD. But I have sufficiently proved above,[m]

[k] Gellius, ix. 5. [where *vulgò* Ἡδονῆς τέλος, κ. τ. λ.—D.]

[l] Prolegom. ad Hieroclem, p. 14.

[m] See here, vol. i. p. 391.

by the testimonies of four or five good witnesses, that Pythagoras was the first that called the universe κόσμος. And I humbly conceive, that very few, when they have considered what I have said about the ages of Phalaris and Pythagoras, will believe that the Tyrant was a disciple of the philosopher's. The word ΚΟΣΜΟΣ, therefore, is another detection of the Sophist's imposture; and not κόσμος only, but APMONIA too, for that also is a Pythagorical expression; and it was a position of that sect, καθ' APMONIAN συνεστάναι τὰ ὅλα, that the universe and all things in it consisted by HARMONY;[n] which is the very notion here of the Sophist.

XVIII.

Demosthenes made the oration *De Coronâ* when Aristophon was archon, Ol. CXII. 3. This we know from the famous critic Dionysius Halicarnassensis; but the passage where he tells this wants emendation.[o] (Ὁ) περὶ τοῦ Στεφάνου (λόγος) . . . ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶντος ἄρχοντος μὲν ἐνιαυτὸν μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, ὀκτὼ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Φιλίππου τελευτήν. Some editions have in the margin ἐνιαυτῷ, instead of ἐνιαυτὸν: but the whole passage is to be read thus; ἐπ' Ἀριστοφῶντος ἄρχοντος, ἡ (*i. e.* ὀγδόῳ) μὲν ἐνιαυτῷ μετὰ τὴν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ μάχην, ἕκτῳ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Φιλίππου τελευτήν: that is, *the oration about the Crown was made in Aristophon's archonship, the* VIIIth *year after the battle at Chæronea, and the* VIth *after Philip's death.** That the numbers

[n] Laërt. in Pythag. [o] Dionys. Halic. de Demosth. p. 124.

[* See the examination of the difficulties in the date of the cause περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου, in the Ap. to Clinton's *Fasti Hellen. from* LV. *to* CXXIV. *Ol.* p. 361, 362, 363, 364. *sec. ed.*—D.]

here are agreeable to matter of fact appears from Diodorus, and from Dionysius himself, in his Life of Dinarchus. In that oration the orator has given us the epitaph that was made by public order upon some of those that were slain in the war against Philip, the last distich of which is this;[p]

Μηδὲν ἁμαρτεῖν ἐστι θεῶν, καὶ πάντα κατορθοῦν·
Ἐν βιοτῇ μοῖραν δ' οὔτι φυγεῖν ἔπορεν.

To miscarry in nothing, and to succeed well in every thing, belongs only to the gods. This part of the epitaph became very famous in the following ages, and was often cited; as by Themistius,[q] *Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνειν ἔξω τῆς φύσεως κεῖται ἀνθρωπίνης,* &c.; that is, *to miscarry in nothing, is above the power of human nature; for I cannot believe there were ever such men as the Stoics describe and call wise; and the epigram that was written upon the public sepulchre at Athens seems to say truer, for it makes the miscarrying in nothing to be the attribute of the gods alone; καὶ γὰρ τοῖς θεοῖς μόνοις τὸ πάντα κατορθοῦν ἀπονέμει.* 'Tis cited too by an anonymous author in Suidas:[r] *Ὀρθῶς γὰρ εἴρηται, τὸ μὲν μηδὲν ἁμαρτεῖν θεοῦ ἐστι, καὶ πάντα κατορθοῦν· ἄνθρωπος δὲ οὐκ ἂν εἴποι ἐπ' οὐδενὶ, ὅτι μὴ πείσεται τόδε τι.* *'Tis a good saying, that to miscarry in nothing, and to succeed in every thing, is the property of God; but a man can say upon no occasion that such a thing shall not befall him.* Justinian too seems to mean it, when he says,[s] *Omnium habere memoriam, et penitùs*

[p] Demosth. de Coronâ, p. 187. [*Or. Att.* IV. (*pars pr.*) p. 355. *ed. Bekk.*, where ——— *κατορθοῦν*
ἐν βιοτῇ, μοῖραν, κ. τ. λ. D.]

[q] Themist. Orat. iii. [=xxii. p. 276. *ed. Hard.* 1684, where *τῆς ἀνθρωπ.*—D.]

[r] Suid. v. *Ξυγγνώμονα.*

[s] Cod. lib. i. tit. 17. leg. ii. § 14.

in nullo peccare, divinitatis magis quàm mortalitatis est; quod et à majoribus dictum est. But the strangest thing of all is, that the Tyrant is introduced with that very saying in his mouth, Τὸ μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνειν εἰκότως ἴσως καὶ δικαίως θεοῦ νομίζεται; *never to miscarry in any thing is reasonably, perhaps, and justly, accounted to be the privilege of God alone.*[t] And yet the Tyrant himself had made his last and fatal *miscarriage* above cc. years before that epitaph was written.

XIX.

There's nothing in the world more liberal and profuse than a sophist; he can give five or six thousand pound sterling with as little concern as another man would part with ten shillings. The first present that the writer of Euripides's *Letters* gives the poet was no less than XL. talents,[u] which amounts to 7,200*l.* English. But our mock Phalaris goes quite beyond him in generosity; for he rewards Polyclitus, a physician that had cured him of a dangerous distemper, *with* IV. *goblets of refined gold,* II. *silver bowls of ancient workmanship not to be matched in the present age,* X. *couple of large Thericlean cups,* XX. *young boys for his slaves, and* 50,000 *Attic drachms; besides an annual salary for life, as great as was paid to the chief officers of his fleet and army.*[v] Now, this is a story credible enough, if we consider that a sophist was the paymaster; for, as the actors in comedies paid all their debts upon the stage with lupins, so a sophist pays all his with words. But, if we consider the true

[t] Ep. 129. [u] Eurip. Epist. v. [v] Phal. Ep. 70.

Phalaris and real physician of that age, the whole is most improbable and absurd, both in respect of him that gives and of him that receives.

First, it does not at all suit with the state of those times, that the Tyrant should so abound in gold *as to give* IV. *cups of that metal,* which perhaps were more than he had in all his possessions. We are assured, by good hands, that in those days *gold was a very scarce commodity in Greece;* σπάνιον ὄντως τὸ παλαιὸν παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὁ χρυσὸς καὶ πάνυ, are the words of Athenæus,[w] who adds, that the first gold that shone among the Greeks was that which was plundered from the temple of Delphi by the Phocæans, which happened Olymp. CVI. 3. Afterwards, says he, when Alexander had conquered Asia, there was plenty of it brought among them. But in Phalaris's time there was scarce any gold to be found in all Greece, as appears by this story. The Spartans were commanded by the oracle to gild the face of Apollo's statue with gold; and having in vain inquired in Greece for some of that metal, they asked the oracle where they might purchase any? and he ordered them to go to Crœsus king of Lydia, and buy some of him, which was accordingly done.[x] This is told us by Athenæus, out of two very ancient and credible historians, Theopompus a scholar of Isocrates's, and Phanias a scholar of Aristotle's. Now, Crœsus, we know, was contemporary with Phalaris;

[w] Athen. p. 231. [=II. 388. *ed. Schw.*, where σπάνιος γὰρ ὄντως ἦν τὸ παλ. —D.]

[x] Athen. 232. [=II. 390. *ed. Schw.* The Spartans were not "commanded "by the oracle" to gild the face of the statue: Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὖν χρυσῶσαι βουλόμενοι τὸ πρόσωπον, κ. τ. λ.—D.]

so that in the Tyrant's time there was not gold enough in Greece (except what was already consecrated in the temples) to gild the face of a statue; and yet the Sophist gives away in one Letter more than would have gilt the whole statue from head to foot. Nay, even at or after the plundering of the temple at Delphi, gold was yet so scarce in Greece, that Philip king of Macedon having a little golden cup, φιάλιον χρυσοῦν, weighing no more than L. drachmæ, or half a pound troy-weight, was so chary of it, and afraid it should be stolen from him, that every night, when he went to bed, he put it under his pillow.[y] And yet we see the *Sicilian prince* so abounded with it CC. years before, that he could spare four golden cups, φιάλας τέσσαρας, of the very same fashion with king Philip's, only all of them larger, for one gift to a favourite. But perhaps the admirers of Phalaris will be ready to say, that gold might be common in Sicily, though scarce in other countries in Greece. But then another piece of history lies cross in their way: for the same Theopompus and Phanias tell us farther, that when Hiero king of Syracuse, who began his reign above LXX. years after Phalaris's was ended, had purposed to make a tripus and a victoria of fine gold, ἀπέφθου χρυσοῦ, and present it to Apollo at Delphi, he sought a long time in Sicily for gold, but none could be found. Whereupon he sent messengers into Greece, who, after a long search to no purpose, at last met with some at Corinth in the hands of one Architeles, who, having for many years

[y] Athen. p. 155 and 231. [=II. 105 and 388. *ed. Schw.*—D.] Pliny, xxxiii. 3. Eustath. Iliad. p. 815.

bought up gold by little and little, had amassed a pretty quantity of it.[a] But it's something strange that Hiero should be forced to send out of Sicily for gold, and yet Phalaris so long before him would have his very physician served in gold plate, ἀπέφθου χρυσοῦ, of the very same fineness that Hiero wanted. 'Tis true the same historians tell us, that, a year or two before Hiero's reign, his brother Gelo had dedicated a tripus and a victoria to Apollo.[a] But of Gelo's donary we have had occasion to speak already;[b] and it appears there, that the gold which Gelo then had was the spoil of the Carthaginians; so that it was not in Sicily in Phalaris's days, neither did it continue long there. For the Carthaginian army brought it Olymp. LXXV. 1.; and before the end of Hiero's reign, Olymp. LXXVIII. 2., there was none of it to be found.

In the next place, if we consider the receiver of this vast present, Polyclitus the physician, the reward will seem disproportioned to the condition of the man. It was the common practice of those old times to hire physicians by the year, for the service of a whole city, and to pay them out of the public stock;[c] nay, some of the lawgivers took express care of it in the very constitution of their governments.[d] The general price of a year's service we may learn from Herodotus,[e] where he tells us how Democedes the Crotonian, who had the greatest reputation of all

[a] Athen. 232. [=II. 391. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[a] Athen. p. 231. [=II. 390. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[b] See here, p. 58, 59. of this vol.

[c] Strabo, p. 181. Aristoph. and Schol. p. 301. [=*Acharn.* v. 994. *ed. Bekk.* —D.]

[d] Diodor. p. 80.

[e] Herod. iii. 131.

the physicians of his time, which was a few years after Phalaris's death, was hired publicly a whole year by the Æginæans for one talent; and the next year by the Athenians for a hundred minæ, *i. e.* a talent and $\frac{2}{3}$; and the next year by Polycrates the Samian for two talents. Now, what proportion does this bear to the extravagant present of the *Sicilian prince?* where, besides the gold and silver vessels, and the score of handsome slaves, and the yearly pension equal to an admiral's, the very ready money, 50,000 Attic drachms, comes to VIII. talents and $\frac{1}{3}$, which is more than Democedes could earn in four whole years: and yet Polycrates excelled Phalaris in riches and power, as much as Democedes may be supposed to excel in his art this unknown Polyclitus. And if we take our measure from those physicians that were not hired by the public, but practised privately for fees, as the custom is now, the disproportion will still be the greater. For the ordinary fee of a physician was very low in those days and after, as appears by those famous verses of the philosopher Crates,[f] where he represents the account-book of some of the wealthy men of that age;

> *Τίθει μαγείρῳ μνᾶς δέκ', ἰατρῷ δραχμὴν,*
> *Κόλακι τάλαντα πέντε, συμβούλῳ καπνὸν,*
> *Πόρνῃ τάλαντον, φιλοσόφῳ τριώβολον.*

i. e. *to a cook* 30*l.*, *to a physician two groats, to a flatterer* 900*l.*, *to a counsellor nothing, to a whore* 180*l.*, *to a philosopher a groat.* 'Tis true the same Democedes, when he afterwards in Persia cured Darius's

[f] Laërt. in Cratete. [l. 355. *ed. Meib.*—D.]

foot, had a very rich present of gold by the emperor's wives; but to argue from the riches of the Persian court, that the like might be done at Agrigentum, is truly, as the mock Phalaris says, *to compare an Indian elephant to a fly.*

XX.

Tatian, in the beginning of his oration *Against the Greeks,* gives a list of some inventors; and among the rest he tells us, out of Hellanicus the historian, *that Atossa the Persian empress was the first that wrote epistles;* Ἐπιστολὰς συντάσσειν (ἐξεῦρεν) ἡ Περσῶν ποτε ἡγησαμένη γυνή, καθάπερ φησὶν Ἑλλάνικος, Ἄτοσσα δὲ ὄνομα αὐτῇ ἦν. The same thing is affirmed by Clemens Alexandrinus, and from the same author; Πρώτην ἐπιστολὰς συντάξαι Ἄτοσσαν τὴν Περσῶν βασιλεύσασάν φησιν Ἑλλάνικος.[g] Now, that Atossa was younger than Phalaris by one or two generations, appears several ways. She was the sister and wife of Cambyses,[h] who began his reign Olymp. LXII. 4. She was afterwards married to Darius,[i] and was alive at his death, Olymp. LXXIII. 4. Nay, she was still alive when Xerxes returned from his expedition, Olymp. LXXV. 1., as it's evident from *Persæ,* a tragedy of Æschylus. The odd manner of her death is told us by Aspasius; *that her son Xerxes in a fit of distraction butchered her and eat her;* Ξέρξης, says he, ὁ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς μανεὶς ἔφαγε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα κρεουργήσας.[j] Now, suppose him to have done this in the

[g] Clem. Alex. Strom. i. p. 132.
[h] Herod.
[i] Herod.
[j] Aspasius ad Aristot. Ethic. p. 124.

very year of his return, yet Atossa would survive Phalaris LXX. years; though we allow him by the most favourable account to have lived till Olymp. LVII. 3. And according to Hippostratus and the Scholiast of Pindar,[j] she is two generations lower than Phalaris;

Phalaris—1. *Telemachus.*		
2. *Emmenides.*		
3. *Ænesidamus.*	1. *Atossa.*	
Reigned 4. *Theron.*	2. *Xerxes.*	Reigned
Ol. LXXIII. 1.		Ol. LXXIII. 4.

It is evident, then, that if Atossa was the first inventress of epistles, these that carry the name of Phalaris, who was so much older than her, must needs be an imposture. And that she really found out the way of epistles, we have the most proper and competent witness that can possibly be had. For Hellanicus was a contemporary of this Atossa, being LXV. years old at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war:[k] so that he was born at Ol. LXXI. 2., and was in the XVIth year of his age at Xerxes's expedition. But, besides the authority of Hellanicus, Clemens tells us of himself,[l] that he took his account of the several inventors from Scamon, Theophrastus, Cydippus, Aristophanes, Aristodemus, Aristotle, Philostephanus, and Strato, in their books *About Inventions*:[m] so that either all or at least some of these must be supposed to have reported that invention of Atossa's. And I conceive we have a double argument here against our

[j] See here, vol. i. p. 103, 104.
[k] Gellius, xv. 23.
[l] Clemens, ibid.
[m] Περὶ Εὑρημάτων.

mock Phalaris; a positive one, that Atossa first invented epistles; and a negative, that the *Epistles* of Phalaris were not heard of in the days of those writers.

The words of Tatian and Clemens are, ἐπιστολὰς συντάσσειν: now, whether we take συντάσσειν in a general sense for *writing*, or more strictly for *comprising in a volume and publishing*, 'tis either way sufficient to prove Phalaris's *Epistles* a cheat. But it may be objected in their behalf, that epistles were in use many hundred years before Phalaris, even before the Trojan times; as appears from Apollodorus and Zenobius[n] and others, who relate how Bellerophontes carried ἐπιστολὰς, *epistles*, from Prœtus to Iobates: and how then can Atossa be called the inventress of epistles? But, in answer to this, we are to observe that those authors speak not accurately there, but accommodate their expression to the manners of their own times. For Homer, out of whom they all have it, does not call it an *epistle*, but πίναξ πτυκτός:

——Πόρεν δ' ὅγε σήματα λυγρὰ,
Γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά.[o]

Now, πίναξ πτυκτὸς is the same with δελτὸς, and in Latin *tabellæ*, *pugillares*, *codicilli*, small leaves of wood covered with bees-wax, and so written on by a pen of metal. So Pliny interprets this passage of Homer, *Pugillarium usum fuisse etiam ante Trojana tempora invenimus apud Homerum.*[p] And he expressly affirms, that the writings that Bellerophontes carried

[n] Apollod. p. 81. Zenob. p. 50.
[o] Hom. Il. ζ. v. 169.
[p] Pliny, xiii. c. 11.

were not epistles, but codicils: (Homerus) Bellerophonti codicillos datos, non epistolas, prodidit.[q] Now, it's evident that these *codicils* could never serve for a volume of letters, as Phalaris's are; for the use of them was only for a single letter, which as soon as read was erased, and the wax smoothed anew, and so the codicils were returned with an answer upon the same wax where the former letter was written. The occasion of Pliny's writing this last passage is pleasant enough. Licinius Mucianus had reported in his History, *that when he was governor of Lycia, himself saw and read in a certain temple there a paper-epistle written from Troy by Sarpedon.*[r] Now, if this were true, Hellanicus and his followers must be miserably out when they make Atossa invent epistles so many hundreds of years after. *But I wonder*, says Pliny, *at this paper-letter*[s] *of Sarpedon's, since even in Homer's time, so long after Sarpedon, that part of Egypt which alone produces paper was nothing but sea, being afterwards produced by the mud of the Nile. Or, if paper was in use in Sarpedon's time, how came Homer to say, that in that very Lycia where Sarpedon lived, not epistles, but codicils, were given to Bellerophontes?*[t] So that learned naturalist refutes the pretended letter of Sarpedon, though, with humble submission, he puts a false colour upon one part of his argument; for the epistle was not given to Bellerophontes in Lycia, but in Argos of Peloponnesus, to be carried to Lycia.

[q] Ibid. c. 13.

[r] Sarpedonis à Trojâ scriptam in quodam templo epistolæ chartam. Plin. ibid.

[s] Papyrus, charta.

[t] In ipsâ illâ Lyciâ . . . codicillos datos, non epistolas.

However, without that needless colour, he has sufficiently confuted the credulity of Mucianus, who, though he was governor of a great province, and general of a great army, and three times consul in Claudius's and Vespasian's time, and, besides all that, a learned and inquisitive man, was miserably imposed on with a sham letter of Sarpedon's: a remarkable instance, that not only the title of *Honourable,* but even the highest quality and greatest experience, cannot always secure a man from cheats and impostures!

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES

OF

PHALARIS, THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES, AND THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

(Appended to Wotton's *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, 1697.)

SIR WILLIAM TEMPLE'S Essay upon Ancient and Modern Learning, pag. 58.

" *It may perhaps be further affirmed, in favour of the* " *ancients, that the oldest books we have are still in their* " *kind the best. The two most ancient that I know of in* " *prose, among those we call profane authors, are Æsop's* " Fables *and Phalaris's* Epistles, *both living near the same* " *time, which was that of Cyrus and Pythagoras. As the* " *first has been agreed by all ages since for the greatest* " *master in his kind, and all others of that sort have been but* " *imitations of his original; so I think the* Epistles *of Pha-* " *laris to have more race, more spirit, more force of wit and* " *genius, than any others I have ever seen, either ancient or* " *modern. I know several learned men (or that usually pass* " *for such, under the name of critics) have not esteemed them* " *genuine; and Politian, with some others, have attributed* " *them to Lucian: but I think he must have little skill in* " *painting, that cannot find out this to be an original. Such* " *diversity of passions, upon such variety of actions and* " *passages of life and government; such freedom of thought,* " *such boldness of expression; such bounty to his friends,* " *such scorn of his enemies; such honour of learned men,* " *such esteem of good; such knowledge of life, such contempt* " *of death; with such fierceness of nature and cruelty of* " *revenge, could never be represented but by him that pos-* " *sessed them. And I esteem Lucian to have been no more* " *capable of writing than of acting what Phalaris did. In* " *all one writ you find the scholar or the sophist: and all* " *the other, the tyrant and the commander.*"

A

DISSERTATION

UPON THE

EPISTLES OF PHALARIS, &c.

TO MR. WOTTON.

SIR,*

I REMEMBER that, discoursing with you upon this passage of Sir W. T. (which I have here set down), I happened to say, that, with all deference to so great an authority, and under a just awe of so sharp a censure, I believed it might be even demonstrated that the *Epistles* of Phalaris are spurious, and that we have nothing now extant of Æsop's own composing. This casual declaration of my opinion, by the power of that long friendship that has been between us, you improved into a promise, that I would send you my reasons in writing, to be added to the new edition of your book, believing it, as I suppose, a considerable point in the controversy you are engaged in. For if it once be made out, that those writings your adversary so extols are supposititious, and of no very long standing, you have then his and his party's own confession, that some of the later pens have outdone the old ones in their kinds: and to others,

[* As this address has been quoted in a note, vol. i. p. 78, 79., it is necessary to state, that I originally intended to omit that portion of Bentley's Appendix to Wotton's work which treats of the Epistles of Phalaris; but, since the preceding sheets were sent to press, I have seen the propriety of reprinting the Appendix entire.—D.]

kind are so easily imposed on in this way, that there is too great invitation to put the trick upon them. What clumsy cheats, those Sibylline Oracles now extant, and Aristeas's story of the Septuagint, passed without control even among very learned men! And even some modern attempts of this kind have met with success not altogether discouraging. For though Annius of Viterbo,* after a reputation of some years, and Inghiramius immediately, were shamed out of all credit; yet Sigonius's Essay *De Consolatione*, as coming from a skilful hand, may perhaps pass for Cicero's with some, as long as Cicero himself shall last. Which I cannot presage of that bungling supplement to Petronius (I mean not that from Traw, but the pretended one from Buda),† that scandal to all forgeries: though, I hear, 'tis at present admired as a genuine piece by some that think themselves no ordinary judges.

OF

PHALARIS'S EPISTLES.

THAT Sophist, whoever he was, that wrote a small book of letters in the name and character of Phalaris, (give me leave to say this now, which I shall prove by and by,) had not so bad a hand at humouring and personating, but that several believed it was the Tyrant himself that talked so big, and could not discover the ass under the skin of that lion. For we find Stobæus[d] quoting the 38, and 67, and 72, of those *Epistles*, under the title of Phalaris. And Suidas, in the account he gives of him, says he has wrote *most admirable letters*, ἐπιστολὰς θαυμασίας πάνυ, meaning those that we are speaking of. And Johannes Tzetzes, a man of much

[* See notes, vol. i. p. 84.—D.]
[† See vol. i. p. 88.—D.]

[d] Stob. tit. vii.

rambling learning, has many and large extracts out of them in his *Chiliads*, ascribing them all to the Tyrant whose livery they wear. These three, I think, are the only men among the ancients that make any mention of them; but since they give not the least hint of any doubts concerning their author, we may conclude that all the scholars of those ages received them as true originals; so that they have the general warrant and certificate for this last thousand years before the restoration of learning. As for the moderns, besides the approbation of those smaller critics that have been concerned in the editions of them, and cry them up of course, some very learned men have espoused and maintained them, such as Thomas Fazellus[e] and Jacobus Cappellus.[f] Even Mr. Selden himself[g] draws an argument in chronology from them, without discovering any suspicion or jealousy of a cheat. To whom I may add their latest and greatest advocate, who has honoured them with that most high character prefixt to this treatise.

Others, indeed, have shewn their distrust of Phalaris's title to them; but are content to declare their sentiment without assigning their reasons. *Phalaris, or somebody else*, says Cælius Rhod. lib. iii. c. 7. *The Epistles that go under the name of Phalaris*, Menagius *ad Laërt.* p. 35. Some name the very person at whose door they lay the forgery. *Lucian, whom they commonly mistake for Phalaris*, says Ang. Politianus, *Epist.* 1. *The Epistles of Phalaris, if they are truly his, and not rather Lucian's*, Lilius Greg. Gyraldus, *Poët. Hist.* p. 88.; who in another place, p. 332., informs us that Politian's opinion had generally obtained among the learned of that age: *The Epistles*, says he, *of Phalaris, which most people attribute to Lucian.* How judiciously they ascribe them to Lucian, we shall see better anon; after I have examined the case of Phalaris, who has the plea and right of possession. And I shall not go to

[e] Historia Sicula, p. 118.

[f] Historia Sacra et Exotica, p. 249.

[g] Marm. Arundel. p. 106.

dispossess him, as those have done before me, by an arbitrary sentence in his own tyrannical way; but proceed with him upon lawful evidence, and a fair, impartial trial. And I am very much mistaken in the nature and force of my proofs, if ever any man hereafter, that reads them, persist in his old opinion of making Phalaris an author.

The censures that are made from style and language alone are commonly nice and uncertain, and depend upon slender notices. Some very sagacious and learned men have been deceived in those conjectures, even to ridicule. The great Scaliger* published a few Iambics, as a choice fragment of an old Tragedian, given him by Muretus; who soon after confessed the jest, that they were made by himself. Boxhornius writ a commentary upon a small poem *De Lite*, supposed by him to be some ancient author's; but it was soon discovered to be Michael Hospitalius's, a late Chancellor of France. So that if I had no other argument but the style to detect the spuriousness of Phalaris's *Epistles;* I myself, indeed, should be satisfied with that alone, but I durst not hope to convince every body else. I shall begin, therefore, with another sort of proofs, that will affect the most slow judgments, and assure the most timid or incredulous.

The time of Phalaris's tyranny cannot be precisely determined, so various and defective are the accounts of those that write of him. Eusebius sets the beginning of it Olymp. XXXI. 2., *Phalaris apud Agrigentinos tyrannidem exercet;* and the end of it Olymp. XXXVII. 2.,† *Phalaridis tyrannis destructa.* By which reckoning he governed XXVIII. years. But St. Hierom, out of some unknown chronologer (for that note is not extant in the Greek of Eusebius), gives a different time of his reign, above LXXX. years later than the other; Olymp. LIII. 3., or, as other copies read it, LII. 2., *Phalaris tyrannidem exercuit annos* XVI. Which is agreeable to Suidas, who places him *κατὰ τὴν νβ' Ὀλυμπιάδα,* about

[* See *Scaliger in Varr. de Re Rust.* p. 212. *ed. Steph.* 1573.—D.]
[† See vol. i. p. 99.—D.]

the LII. Olympiad. If the former account be admitted, the cheat is manifest at first sight; for those letters of Phalaris to Stesichorus and Pythagoras must of necessity be false. Because Stesichorus was but VI. years old at that supposed time of Phalaris's death; and Pythagoras was not taken notice of in Greece till LXXX. years after it. But, for the sake of Aristotle and Jamblichus, who make these three to be contemporaries, and that I may prevent all possible cavils and exceptions; I am willing to allow the latter account, the more favourable to the pretended *Letters;* his government commencing Olymp. LIII. 3., and expiring after XVI. years, Olymp. LVII. 3.

I. In the last Epistle, to those of Enna, a city of Sicily, Phalaris says the Hyblenses and Phintienses had promised to lend him money at interest; *Οἱ δὲ ὑπέσχηντο δανείσειν, ὡς Ὑβλαῖοι καὶ Φιντιεῖς.* The Sophist was careful to mention such cities as he knew were in Sicily. For so Ptolemy places *Φιντία* there; and Antoninus, Phintis; and Pliny, Phintienses. But it is ill luck for this forger of letters, that a fragment of Diodorus,[h] a Sicilian, and well acquainted with the history of his country, was preserved to be a witness against him. That excellent writer informs us, that Phintias Tyrant of Agrigentum (the very place where Phalaris was before him,) first built Phintia, calling it by his own name; *Κτίζει δὲ Φιντίας πόλιν, ὀνομάσας αὐτὴν Φιντιάδα;* and that this was done while the Romans were at war with king Pyrrhus, that is, Olymp. CXXV.; which is above CCLXX. years after Phalaris's death, taking even the later account of St. Hierom. A pretty slip this of our Sophist, who, like the rest of his profession, was more versed in the books of orators than historians, to introduce his Tyrant borrowing money of a city almost CCC. years before it was named or built.

II. In the XCII. Epistle he threatens Stesichorus the poet for raising money and soldiers against him at Aluntium

[h] Diod. p. 867.

and Alæsa, *καὶ εἰς Ἀλοΰντιον καὶ εἰς Ἄλαισαν*; and that perhaps he might be snapt before he got home again from Alæsa to Himera, *ἐξ Ἀλαίσης εἰς Ἱμέραν*. What a pity 'tis again, that the Sophist had not read Diodorus! for he would have told him that this Alæsa was not in being in Phalaris's days. It was first built by Archonides,[i] a Sicilian, Olymp. XCIV. 2.; or, as others say, by the Carthaginians, about two years before. So that here are above CXX. years slipt, since the latest period of Phalaris. And we must add above a dozen more to the reckoning, upon the Sophist's own score: for this letter is supposed to bear date before Stesichorus and Phalaris were made friends, which was a dozen years, as he tells his tale,[j] before Stesichorus died; and Phalaris he makes to survive him. I am aware that the same author says,[k] that there were other cities in Sicily called Alæsa; but it is evident from the situation, that this Alæsa of Archonides is meant in the *Epistles;* for this lies on the same coast with Himera and Aluntium (to which two the Sophist here joins it), and is at a small distance from them. And indeed there was no other town of that name in the days of the Sophist, the rest being ruined long before.

III. The LXX. Epistle gives an account of several rich presents to Polyclitus the Messenian physician, for doing a great cure upon Phalaris. Among the rest he names *ποτηρίων Θηρικλείων ζεύγη δέκα, ten couple of Thericlean cups.* But there is another thing, besides a pretty invention, very useful to a liar; and that is, a good memory. For we will suppose our author to have once known something of these cups, the time and the reason they were first called so; but that he had unhappily forgot it when he writ this Epistle. They were large drinking-cups, of a peculiar shape, so called from the first contriver of them, one Thericles, a Corinthian potter. Pliny, by mistaking his author Theophrastus, makes him a turner, lib. xvi. cap. 40., *Celebratur et Thericles*

[i] Diod. p. 246.
[j] Epist. 103.
[k] Diod. ibid.

nomine, calices ex terebintho solitus facere torno. The words of Theophrastus are these, *Hist. Plant.* l. v. cap. 4., *Τορνεύεσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτῆς (τερμίνθου) κύλικας Θηρικλείους, ὥστε μηδ' ἂν ἕνα διαγνῶναι πρὸς τὰς κεραμέας; that the turners make Thericlean cups of the turpentine tree, which cannot be distinguished from those made by the potters.* [T]here can nothing be gathered hence to make Thericles himself a turner; for, after he had first invented them, they were called *Thericlean* from their shape, whatsoever artificer made them, and whether of earth, or of wood, or of metal. But, as I said, by the general consent of writers, we must call him a potter. Hesychius, *Θηρίκλειος, κύλικος εἶδος, ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους κεραμέως.* Lucian in *Lexiphanes*, pag. 960., *Καὶ γηγενῆ πολλὰ, οἷα Θηρικλῆς ὤπτα. Etymologicon M., Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ... ἣν λέγουσι, πρῶτος κεραμεὺς Θηρικλῆς ἐποίησεν, ὥς φησιν Εὔβουλος, ὁ τῆς μέσης κωμῳδίας ποιητής.* The words of Eubulus, whom he cites, are extant in Athenæus, lib. xi. p. 471.;*

Καθαρώτερον γὰρ τὸν κέραμον εἰργαζόμην
Ἡ Θηρικλῆς τὰς κύλικας, ἡνίκ' ἦν νέος.

And again,

Ὦ γαῖα κεραμῖτ', ἥ σε Θηρικλῆς ποτε
Ἔτευξε, κοίλης λαγόνος εὐρύνας βάθος.

Now, the next thing to be inquired is the age of this Thericles; and we learn that from Athenæus; one witness indeed, but as good as a multitude in a matter of this nature. Pag. 470.,† *Κατασκευάσαι λέγεται τὴν κύλικα ταύτην Θηρικλῆς ὁ Κορίνθιος κεραμεὺς, ... γεγονὼς τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ τὸν κωμικὸν Ἀριστοφάνη; this cup,* says he, *was invented by Thericles the Corinthian potter, who was contemporary with Aristophanes the comedian.* And, in all probability, he had this indication from some fable of that poet's now lost,

[* = IV. 244, 245. *ed. Schw.*, where in the second passage *κεραμῖτι, ὁ σὲ.*—D.]

[† = IV. 241. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

where that Corinthian was mentioned as one then alive. But all the plays that we have left of his are known to have been written and acted between the LXXXIIX.* and XCVII. Olympiads, which is an interval of XXXVI. years. Take now the very first year of that number; and Thericles, with the cups that had their appellation from him, come above CXX. years after Phalaris's death.

But I must remove one objection that may be made against the force of this argument; for some ancient grammarians give a quite different account why such cups were called *Thericlean.* Some derive the word *Θηρίκλειος, ἀπὸ τῶν θηρίων, from the skins of beasts that were figured upon them:* and Pamphilus the Alexandrian[1] would have them called so, *ἀπὸ τοῦ θῆρας κλονεῖν, because beasts were scared and frightened, when, in sacrifices, wine was poured upon them out of those cups.* So I interpret the words of Pamphilus; *ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν Διόνυσον τοὺς θῆρας κλονεῖν, σπένδοντα ταῖς κύλιξι ταύταις κατ' αὐτῶν.* For what is more ordinary in old authors than the memory of that custom of pouring wine on the heads of the victims?

> *Ipsa, tenens dextrâ pateram, pulcherrima Dido,*
> *Candentis vaccæ media inter cornua fudit.*†

Nor are wild beasts only called *θῆρες*, but tame too, such as bulls and cows; as the Epigrammatist calls the Minotaur *ἄνθρωπον μιξοθῆρα.*‡ I cannot therefore comprehend why the most learned Is. Casaubon will read *σπεύδοντα* in this passage, and not *σπένδοντα.* For I own I see little or no sense in it according to his lection. And as for the authority of the ancient Epitomiser of Athenæus, who, he says, reads it *σπεύδοντα,* one may be certain 'twas a fault only in that copy of him that Casaubon used. For Eustathius, who appears never to have seen the true Athenæus,

[* = LXXXVIII.—D.]

[1] Athenæus, pag. 471. [= IV. 243. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[† Virg. *Æn.* iv. 60.—D.]

[‡ *Ep. adesp. Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) IV. 180.—D.]

but only that Epitome, read it in his book *σπένδοντα*, and took it in the same sense that I now interpret it, p. 1209.* *Iliad.*, *Ἢ διότι θῆρας κλονεῖ, σπένδουσι γὰρ κατ' αὐτῶν κύλιξι τοιαύταις.* And now for those two derivations of the word *Θηρίκλειος*; was ever any thing so forced, so frigid, so unworthy of refutation? Does not common analogy plainly shew, that as from *Ἡρακλῆς* comes *Ἡράκλειος*, from *Σοφοκλῆς*, *Σοφόκλειος*, and many such like; so *Θηρίκλειος* must be from *Θηρικλῆς*? besides so many express authorities for it, which I have cited before. To which I may add that of Julius Pollux, l. vi. c. 16.,† *Θηρίκλειον καὶ Κάνθαρον ἀπὸ τῶν ποιησάντων*: and Plutarch in *P. Æmilius*, pag. 273., *Οἵ τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας, καὶ Σελευκίδας, καὶ Θηρικλείους . . . . ἐπιδεικνύμενοι*: and Clemens Alexand. II. *Pæd.* p. 69., *Ἐῤῥέτων τοίνυν Θηρίκλειοί τινες κύλικες, καὶ Ἀντιγονίδες, καὶ Κάνθαροι.* For one may justly infer, that both Plutarch and Clemens believed *Θηρίκλειοι* to be from *Θηρικλῆς*; because they join them with those other cups, all which had their names from men that either invented or used them. And so says a manuscript note upon that passage of Clemens; *Θηρίκλειοι ἀπὸ Θηρικλέους τοῦ ἐφευρόντος.* So that, upon the whole, let Pamphilus and those other grammarians help him as they can, our Sophist stands fully convicted, upon this indictment, of forgery and imposture.

I must here beg leave of the late learned Editors of our mock Phalaris, with whom I must by and by have some further expostulation, to dissent from their new version of this passage; whereby this argument from Thericles would vanish into nothing. For instead of *ten couple of Thericlean cups*, as the former interpreters honestly translate it, they present us, as an emendation, with the like number of GLASSES, *poculorum vitreorum*, leaving us not the least footstep of our Corinthian potter. But methinks these glasses

[* *ed. Basil.*—D.]
[† p. 623. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

come in but oddly and stingily among those other things named there of great value, φιάλας ἀπέφθου χρυσοῦ, &c. *vessels of gold and silver, beautiful slaves, fifty thousand drachmæ, and a liberal yearly pension for life.* If Agathocles the tyrant had made this present of *a score of glasses*, it might have passed for a mark of favour; because he was a potter in his youth, and we might suppose them of his own making. And, as I remember, Diodorus tells such a story of him. But why Phalaris should make so cheap and brittle a compliment, I cannot conjecture. 'Tis true, Suidas translates it a *glass*, Θηρίκλειον ποτήριον, ὑάλινον; and *Etymolog. Mag.*, Θηρίκλειον κύλικα, ποτήριον ὑέλινον. But we know the old lexicons chiefly consist of *excerpta* out of scholiasts and glossaries upon particular authors; one of which, in one single place, might expound it *a glass*. But that it must universally mean so, or particularly in this passage before us, neither the use of the language nor good sense will allow. For, besides earth, which was the first material, some were made of wood, as Theophrastus says in the place already cited; others of silver or gold, as Plutarch in *P. Æmilius*,* Οἱ δὲ [τε] τὰς .... Θηρικλείους καὶ ὅσα περὶ δεῖπνον ΧΡΥΣΩΜΑΤΑ τοῦ Περσέως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι. And Athenæus, lib. v. p. 199.,† Φέροντες οἱ μὲν οἰνοχόας, οἱ δὲ φιάλας, οἱ δὲ Θηρικλείους μεγάλας, πάντα ΧΡΥΣΑ. And I conceive it were more agreeable to the generosity of Phalaris, which is the subject of so many letters, to suppose these Thericlean cups to be silver at least, if not a more precious metal.

IV. In the LXXXV. Epistle he boasts of a great victory obtained over the Zancleans; Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλείους συμμαχήσαντας Λεοντίνοις εἰς τέλος νενίκηκα. But the very preceding Letter, and the XXI., are directed to the Messenians, Μεσσηνίοις, and the city is there called Μεσσάνη; and in the first Epist. he speaks of Πολύκλειτος ὁ Μεσσήνιος. Here we see we have mention made of Zan-

[* [illegible] *supra cit.*—D.] [† = ii. 267. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

cleans and Messenians, as if Zancle and Messana were two different towns. Certainly the true Phalaris could not write thus; and it is a piece of ignorance inexcusable in our Sophist, not to know that both those names belonged to one and the same city at different times. Strabo, lib. vi. p. 268., *Μεσσήνη, ... Ζάγκλη πρότερον καλουμένη, Messana, which was before called Zancle.* See also Herodotus, lib. vii., and Diodorus, lib. iv., and others. Perhaps it may be suspected, in behalf of these *Epistles*, that this change of name was made during those XVI. years of Phalaris's tyranny; and then, supposing the LXXXV. Letter to be written before the change, and the other three after it, this argument will be evaded. But Thucydides will not suffer this suspicion to pass, who relates,[m] that at the time of Xerxes's expedition into Greece (which was Olymp. LXXIII.), Anaxilaus king of Rhegium besieged Zancle, and took it, and called it Messana, from the Peloponnesian city of that name, the place of his nativity. The same says Herodotus:[n] and agreeably to this narrative, Diodorus[o] sets down the death of this Anaxilaus Olymp. LXXVI. 1., when he had reigned XVIII. years. Take now the latest accounts of Phalaris's death, according to St. Hierom; and above LX. years intervene between that and the new-naming of Zancle. So that, unless we dare ascribe to that Tyrant a spirit of vaticination, we cannot acquit the author of the *Letters* of so manifest a cheat.

But I love to deal ingenuously, and will not conceal one testimony in his favour, which is that of Pausanias,[p] who tells the story very differently from Herodotus and Thucydides, placing this same Anaxilaus of Rhegium about a CLXXX. years higher than they do; that he assisted the refugees of Messana in Peloponnesus, after the second war with the Spartans, to take Zancle in Sicily, which thereupon was called Messana, Olymp. XXIX.: *Ταῦτα δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπράχθη τῆς ἑνάτης καὶ εἰκοστῆς, ἣν Χιόνις*

[m] Lib. vi. p. 414.
[n] Lib. vi. cap. 23.
[o] Lib. xi. p. 37.
[p] Messen. p. 134.

Λάκων τὸ δεύτερον ἐνίκα, Μιλτιάδου παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἄρχοντος. Now, if this be true, we must needs put in one word for our Sophist; that Phalaris might name the Messenians without pretending to the gift of prophecy. Cluverius[q] indeed would spoil all again; for he makes it a fault in our copies of Pausanias, and for *εἰκοστῆς*, the XXIX. Olymp., reads *ἑξηκοστῆς*, the LXIX.; which is too great a number to do our author any service. But we will not take an advantage against him from a mistake of Cluverius; for, without question, the true lection is *εἰκοστῆς*, the XXIX.; because the time of the Messenian war agrees with that computation, and not with the other; and the ancient Catalogue[r] of the *Olympionicæ* puts Chionis's victory at that very year. *Ὀλυμπιὰς εἰκοστὴ ἑνάτη· Χιόνις Λάκων στάδιον. Τριακοστή· ὁ αὐτὸς τὸ δεύτερον.* So that, if Pausanias's credit is able to bear him out, our author, as to this present point, may still come off with reputation. But, alas! what can Pausanias do for him, or for himself, against Herodotus and Thucydides, that lived so near the time they speak of? against those other unknown authors that Diodorus transcribed? against the whole tenour of history, confirmed by so many synchronisms and concurrences, that even demonstrate Anaxilaus to have lived in the days of Xerxes and his father; when Theron, and not Phalaris, was *μούναρχος*, *monarch*, of Agrigentum.[s] Nay, though we should be so obliging, so partial to our Sophist, as for his sake to credit Pausanias against so much greater authority, yet still the botch is incurable; 'tis running in debt with one man, to pay off another. For, how then comes it to pass, that the Messenians in another Letter are in this called Zancleans? which, by that reckoning of Pausanias, had been an obsolete forgotten word an hundred years before the date of this pretended Epistle.

V. That same XCII. Letter, which has furnished us

[q] Sicil. Antiq. p. 85.
[r] Euseb. Scalig. p. 39.
[s] Herod. lib. vii. p. 438.

already with one detection of the imposture, will, if strictly examined, make a second confession, from these words, ὃς αὐτοὺς ἐκτρίψω πίτυος δίκην: 'tis a threat of Phalaris to the Himeræans, *that he would extirpate them like a pine-tree.* Now, here again am I concerned for our Sophist, that he is thus taken tripping. For the original of this saying is thus related by Herodotus:[t] when the Lampsaceni in Asia had taken captive Miltiades the Athenian, Crœsus king of Lydia sent them a message, that if they did not set him free, he would come and *extirpate them like a pine,* σφέας πίτυος τρόπον ἀπείλεε ἐκτρίψειν. The men of Lampsacus understood not the meaning of that expression, *like a pine,* till one of the eldest of them hit upon it, and told them, that *of all trees, the pine, when once it is cut down, never grows again, but utterly perishes.* We see the phrase was then so new and unheard of, that it puzzled a whole city. But now, if Crœsus was upon that occasion the first author of this saying, what becomes of this Epistle? For this, as I observed before, being pretended to be written above a dozen years before Phalaris's death, carries date at least half a dozen before Crœsus began his reign.

Nay, there is good ground of suspicion that Herodotus himself, who wrote an hundred years after Phalaris was killed, was the first broacher of this expression. For 'tis known those first historians make every body's speeches for them. So that the blunder of our Sophist is so much the more shameful. The third [fourth] chapter of the VIII. book of A. Gellius, which is now lost, carried this title, *Quòd Herodotus . . . . parùm verè dixerit, unam solamque pinum arborum omnium cæsam nunquam denuò ex iisdem radicibus pullulare;* "that Herodotus is in the wrong in "saying that, of all trees, a pine only, if lopt, never grows "again." I suppose Gellius in that chapter told us, out of Theophrastus,[u] of some other trees, beside the pine, that

[t] Lib. vi. cap. 37.

[u] Hist. Pl. lib. iv. c. 19. Caus. Pl. l. v. c. 24. Plin. l. xvii. c.

perish by lopping; the *pitch-tree*, the *fir*, the *palm*, the *cedar*, and the *cypress*. But I would have it observed, that he attributes the saying, and the mistake about it, not to Crœsus, but to Herodotus; after whom it became a proverb, which denotes an utter destruction, without any possibility of flourishing again. See πεύκης τρόπον in Zenobius, Diogenianus, and Suidas. And 'tis remarkable that our Lettermonger has Herodotus's very words, πίτυς and ἐκτρίψειν; when all those three other writers have πεύκη for πίτυς, and κόπτειν instead of ἐκτρίβειν; which shews he had in his eye and memory this very place of Herodotus. A strange piece of stupidity, or else contempt of his readers, to pretend to assume the garb and person of Phalaris, and yet knowingly to put words in his mouth not heard of till a whole century after him.

But here again our late Editors, as if they had been bribed for the Sophist, have lopt off and destroyed this branch of our evidence as far as lay in their power; for they have made bold to execute this proverb upon itself, and have quite *extirpated the pine-tree* out of their new version: ὃς αὐτοὺς ἐκτρίψω πίτυος δίκην, that is, *qui eos in arundinis morem* [*modum*] *conteret*, "who will bruise them like a reed," say our critical interpreters. It seems the translation in the former editions, *qui eos exscindam instar pinus*, was too easy and vulgar. In H. Scripture, indeed, there is mention, by a very elegant metaphor, of *bruised* and *broken reeds*. But why reeds must be transplanted hither, and the innocent pine rooted up, I confess to be above my small understanding in gardening.

VI. In the LXXXV. Epistle we have already taken notice of our mock Tyrant's triumph, ὅτι Ταυρομενείτας καὶ Ζαγκλείους εἰς τέλος νενίκηκε, *that he had utterly routed the Tauromenites and the Zancleans*. But there's an old and true saying, Πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου, *many new and strange things happen in war*. For we have just now seen those same routed Zancleans rise up again, after a thousand years, to give him a worse defeat. And now the others too are

taking their turn to revenge their old losses. For these, though they are called *Tauromenites* both here and in the xv., xxxi., and xxxiii. Epistles, make protestation against the name, and declare they were called *Naxians* in the days of the true Phalaris. *Taurominium, quæ antea Naxos,* says Pliny, lib. iii. c. viii. *Taurominium, quam prisci Naxon vocabant,* says Solinus, cap. xi.* Whence it is that Herodotus and Thucydides, because they writ before the change of the name, never speak of Taurominium, but of Naxos and the Naxians. A full account of the time, and the reason, and the manner of the change is thus given by Diodorus.[v] Some Sicilians planted themselves, Olymp. xcvi. 1., upon a hill called *Taurus,* near the ruins of Naxus, and built a new town there, which they called *Tauromenion, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταῦρος καὶ μένειν,* from *their settlement upon Taurus.* About forty years after this, Olymp. cv. 3., one Andromachus,[w] a Tauromenite, gathered all the remnant of the old Naxians that were dispersed through Sicily, and persuaded them to fix there. This is such a plain and punctual testimony, that neither the power and stratagems of the Tyrant, nor the rhetoric of the Sophist, are able to evade it. Where are those, then, that cry up Phalaris for the florid author of the *Letters?* who was burnt in his own Bull above cl. years before Taurominium was ever thought on.

But I shall not omit one thing in defence of the *Epistles,* which, though it will not do the work, let it go, however, as far as it can. We have allowed that Pythagoras was contemporary with Phalaris; and yet in the history of that philosopher we are told of his conversation and exploits at Taurominium. Porphyry says, *he delivered Croton and Himera, καὶ Ταυρομένιον, and Taurominium, from tyrants:*[x] and, *that in one and the same day he was at Metapontium in Italy, and Taurominium in Sicily.*[y] The same story is

[* "*colonia Taurominia, quam,*" &c. cap. v. *ed. Salm.*—D.]

[v] Lib. xiv. p. 282 and 305.

[w] Lib. xv. p. 411.

[x] Vita Pythag. p. 169.

[y] P. 192 and 193.

told by Jamblichus;[z] who supplies us too with another, *that a young man of Taurominium being got drunk, Ταυρομενείτου μειρακίου, Pythagoras played him sober by a few tunes of grave spondees.*[a] These several passages seem to concur with and confirm the credit of the *Letters*, that Taurominium had a name and being in the time of Pythagoras and Phalaris. All this would be very plausible, and our Sophist might come off with a whole skin, but for a cross figure in his own art, *rhetoric*, called *prolepsis* or *anticipation*, viz. when poets or historians call any place by a name which was not yet known in the times they write of. As when Virgil says of Æneas,

———Lavinaque venit
Littora—— [i. 2.]

and of Dædalus,

Chalcidicâque levis tandem super adstitit arce;
[vi. 17.]

he is excused by *prolepsis*, though those places were not yet called so in the times of Dædalus and Æneas. So, when Porphyry and Jamblichus name Taurominium in the story of Pythagoras, meaning Naxos, which was afterwards called so, the same figure acquits them. For 'tis no more than when I say, *Julius Cæsar conquered France, and made an expedition into England:* though I know that Gaul and Britian were the names in that age. But when Phalaris mentions Taurominium so many generations before it was heard of, he cannot have the benefit of that same *prolepsis*. For this is not a poetical, but a prophetical anticipation. And he must either have had the prescience and divination of the Sibyls, or his *Epistles* are as false and commentitious as our *Sibylline Oracles*.

VII. The xxxv. Letter, to Polygnotus, presents us with a sentence of moral; ὅτι λόγος ἔργου σκιὰ παρὰ τοῖς σωφρο-

[z] Jambl. p. 128. [a] P. 109.

νεοτέροις πεπίστευται, that wise men take words for the shadow of things; that is, as the shadow is not alone without the presence of the body, so words are accompanied with the action. 'Tis a very notable saying, and we are obliged to the author of it; and if Phalaris had not modestly hinted that others had said it before him, we might have taken it for his own. But then there was either a strange jumping of good wits, or Democritus was a sorry plagiary, for he laid claim to the first invention of it, as Diogenes Laërtius[b] says, *Τούτου ἔστι καὶ τὸ, λόγος ἔργου σκιή*: and Plutarch,[c] *Λόγος γὰρ ἔργου σκιὴ, κατὰ Δημόκριτον.* What shall we say to this matter? Democritus had the character of a man of probity and wit, who had neither inclination nor need to filch the sayings of others. Besides, here are Plutarch and Diogenes, two witnesses that would scorn to flatter, and to ascribe it to Democritus, had they ever read it in others before him. This bears hard indeed upon the author of the *Letters;* but how can we help it? He should have minded his hits better, when he was minded to act the Tyrant. For Democritus, the first author of the sentence, was too young to know even Pythagoras; *τὰ τῶν χρόνων μάχεται,* says Diogenes;[d] and yet Pythagoras survived Phalaris, nay, deposed him, if we will believe his scholars. We may allow forty years' space for Democritus's writing, from the LXXXIV. Olymp. to the XCIV., in which he died. Now, the earliest of this is above an hundred years after the last period of Phalaris.

I am sensible that Michael Psellus[e] refers this saying to Simonides; and Isidorus Pelus.[f] to the Lacedæmonians. But these two are of little authority, in a case of this nature, against Plutarch and Diogenes. Neither would the matter be mended, should we accept of their testimony. For Simonides was but seven years old, or, as others say, yet unborn, when Phalaris was killed. And were it a Lacedæmonian

[b] Vita Democrit.
[c] De Educat. Puer.
[d] Vita Democ.
[e] De Dæm.
[f] Epist. 252 and 259.

apophthegm, though the date be undetermined, it might fairly be presumed to be more recent than he.

VIII. In the LI. Epistle, to Eteonicus, there is another moral sentence; *Θνητοὺς γὰρ ὄντας ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, ὡς φασί τινες, οὐ προσήκει, mortal men ought not to entertain immortal anger.* But I am afraid he will have no better success with this than the former. For Aristotle,[g] in his *Rhetoric,* among some other sententious verses, cites this iambic as commonly known;

Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν μὴ φύλαττε, θνητὸς ὤν.

This, though the author of it be not named, was probably, like most of those proverbial *gnomæ,* borrowed from the stage; and consequently must be later than Phalaris, let it belong to what poet you please, tragic or comic.

But, because it may be suspected that the poet himself might take the thought from common usage, and only give it the turn and measure of a verse; let us see if we can discover some plainer footsteps of imitation, and detect the lurking Sophist under the mask of the Tyrant. Stobæus[h] gives us these verses out of Euripides's *Philoctetes;*

Ὥσπερ δὲ θνητὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμ' ἡμῶν ἔφυ,
Οὕτω προσήκει μηδὲ τὴν ὀργὴν ἔχειν
Ἀθάνατον, ὅστις σωφρονεῖν ἐπίσταται.

Now, to him that compares these with the words of the Epistle, 'twill be evident that the author had this very passage before his pen: there is *ἔχειν* and *προσήκει*; not only a sameness of sense, but even of words, and those not necessary to the sentence; which could not fall out by accident.* And where has he now a friend at a pinch to support his sinking credit? for Euripides was not born in Phalaris's time. Nay, to come nearer to our mark; from Aristophanes[i] the famous grammarian, (who, after Aristotle, Calli-

[g] Lib. ii. cap. 21. [h] Tit. xx. περὶ Ὀργῆς. [I. 382. *ed. Gaisf.*—D.]
[* See note, vol. i. p. 247.—D.] [i] Argument. Medeæ Eurip.

machus, and others, writ the *Διδασκαλίαι, A Catalogue and Chronology of all the Plays of the Poets;* a work, were it now extant, most useful to ancient history,) we know that this very fable, *Philoctetes,* was written Olymp. LXXXVII., which is CXX. years after the Tyrant's destruction.

IX. The XII. Epistle exhibits Phalaris making this compliment to his friends; *Ὧν εὐτυχούντων, κἂν αὐτὸς ἑτέρῳ συμπλακῶ δαίμονι, ἡσθεὶς οὐδὲν ἧττον εὐτυχεῖν δόξω, that while they continued in prosperity, his joy for that, though himself should fall under misfortunes, would still make him happy.* But methinks those words, *ἑτέρῳ δαίμονι, the other god, or genius,* that is, the *bad* one, have a quaintness in them something poetical, and I am mistaken if they be not borrowed from some retainer to the Muses.* And now I call it to mind, they are Pindar's,[j]

Δαίμων δ' ἕτερος
Ἐς κακὸν τρέψαις ἐδαμά | σατό νιν;

or Callimachus's, for this scazon of his is there cited by the Scholiast,

Οὐ πάντες, ἀλλ' οὓς ἔσχεν ἄτερος δαίμων.†

Whether of these our author made bold with, I cannot determine. Pindar, I should incline to guess, but that I find him familiar with Callimachus upon another occasion, Epist. CXXII., speaking of Perillus's invention of the Brazen Bull; *Ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τὸν ὄλεθρον εὗρε κατὰ τῶν ἐπιβουλευόντων ἀχθηρότατον.* Where he has taken that expression, *τὸν ὄλεθρον εὗρε,* from these verses of Callimachus,[k] that concern the same business,

Πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν, ὃς τὸν ὄλεθρον
Εὗρε, τὸν ἐν χαλκῷ καὶ πυρὶ γινόμενον.

[* See note, vol. i. p. 268.—D.] [j] Pyth. 3. [v. 62. *ed. Heyn.*—D.]
[† *Fr. Call.* XCI. p. 211. *ed. Blom.*—D.]
[k] Schol. Pind. Pyth. 1. [*Fr. Call.* CXIX. p. 235. *ed. Blom.*—D.]

But, be it either of them as you will, I suppose the ages of both those poets are well enough known; so that, without any computation of years, one may pronounce these fine *Epistles* not to belong to Phalaris himself, but to his secretary the Sophist.

X. The XXIII. Epistle is directed to Pythagoras; and there he gives to his doctrine and institution the name of *Philosophy*; *Ἡ Φαλάριδος τυραννὶς τῆς Πυθαγόρου ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ πλεῖστον ὅσον δοκεῖ κεχωρίσθαι.* And so again, in the LVI. he gives him the title of *Philosopher*, *Πυθαγόρᾳ τῷ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΩ.* I could shew now, from a whole crowd of authors, that Pythagoras was the first man that invented that word; but I shall content myself with two, Diogenes Laërtius and Cicero. The former says,[l] *Φιλοσοφίαν πρῶτος ὠνόμασε Πυθαγόρας, καὶ ἑαυτὸν Φιλόσοφον, ἐν Σικυῶνι διαλεγόμενος Λέοντι, τῷ Σικυωνίων τυράννῳ, ἢ Φλιασίων;* *Pythagoras first named Philosophy, and called himself* Philosopher, *in conversation with Leon the Tyrant of Sicyon, or, as some say, of Phlius.* The latter tells us,[m] *That, when Pythagoras had discoursed before Leon; the Tyrant, much taken with his wit and eloquence, asked him what art or trade he professed. Art, says Pythagoras, I profess none; but I am a* PHILOSOPHER. *Leon, in admiration at the newness of the name, inquires what those philosophers were, and wherein they differed from other men; "quinam essent philosophi, et quid "inter eos et reliquos interesset."* What a difference is here between the two Tyrants! The one knows not what *philosopher* means; the other seems to account it as threadbare a word as the name of *Wise* Men of Greece, and that too before ever he had spoken with Pythagoras. We cannot tell, at this distance of time, which conversation was first, that with Phalaris, or that with Leon. But allowing Leon's to be the first, yet it could not be long before the other. And 'tis very hard to believe that the fame of so small a business could so soon reach Phalaris's ear in his

[l] P. 3 and 26.

[m] Tuscul. Quæst. l. v.

castle, through his guard of blue-coats, and the loud bellowings of his Bull. Nay, could we suppose him to have heard of it, yet surely, when he had written to Pythagoras, he would have ushered the word in with some kind of introduction, *that science which you call Philosophy;* and not speak of it as familiarly as if it had been the language of his nurse.

XI. In the LXIII. Epistle he is in great wrath with one Aristolochus, a tragic poet that no body ever heard of, *for writing tragedies against him,* κατ' ἐμοῦ γράφειν τραγῳδίας; and in the XCVII. he threatens Lysinus, another poet of the same stamp with the former, *for writing against him both tragedies and hexameters,* ἀλλ' ἔπη καὶ τραγῳδίας εἰς ἐμὲ γράφεις. Now, to forgive him that silly expression, of writing tragedies *against him,* for he could not be the argument of tragedy while he was living; I must take the boldness to tell him, who am out of his reach, that he lays a false crime to their charge. For there was no such thing nor word as *tragedy* while he tyrannised at Agrigentum. That we may slight that obscure story about Epigenes the Sicyonian, Thespis, we know, was the first inventor of it;

> *Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camenæ*
> *Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poëmata Thespis.**

Neither was the name of tragedy more ancient than the thing, as sometimes it happens, when an old word is borrowed and applied to a new notion; but both were born together, the name being taken from τράγος, the *goat* that was the prize to the best poet and actor.† But *Alcestis,* the first tragedy of Thespis, was acted about the LXI. Olymp.,[n] which is more than twelve years after Phalaris's death.

XII. Had all other ways failed us of detecting this impostor, yet his very speech had betrayed him. For his language is Attic, the beloved dialect of the Sophists, in

[* Hor. *Ars Poët.* v. 275.—D.]
[† See notes, vol. i. p. 285 and 338.—D.]
[n] Marm. Arund. Suidas, Θέσπις.

which all their *μελέται*, or *exercises*, were composed; in which they affected to excel each other, even to pedantry and solecism. But he had forgot that the scene of these *Epistles* was not Athens, but Sicily, where the Doric tongue was generally spoken and written; as, besides the testimonies of others, the very thing speaks itself in the remains of Sicilian authors, Sophron, Epicharmus, Stesichorus, Theocritus, Moschus, and others. How comes it to pass, then, that our Tyrant transacts every thing in Attic, not only foreign affairs of state, but domestic matters with Sicilian friends, but the very accounts of his household? Pray, how came that idiom to be the court language at Agrigentum? 'Tis very strange that a tyrant, and such a tyrant as he, should so doat on the dialect of a democraty, which was so eminently *μισοτύραννος*, the *hater of tyrants;* which, in his very days, had driven out Pisistratus, though a generous and easy governor. Especially since, in those early times, before stage-poetry and philosophy and history had made it famous over Greece, that dialect was no more valued than any of the rest.

I would not be here mistaken, as if I affirmed that the Doric was absolutely universal or original in Sicily. I know that the old Sicani, the natives of the isle, had a peculiar language of their own; and that the Greek tongue there, like the Punic, was only a foreigner, being introduced by those colonies that planted themselves there. Most of which coming from Corinth, Crete, Rhodes, &c., where all spoke the Doric dialect; thence it was that the same idiom so commonly obtained almost all over Sicily; as it appears to have done, to omit other testimonies, from the ancient medals of that island, *ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ, ΜΕΣΣΑΝΙΩΝ, ΘΕΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΠΑΝΟΡΜΙΤΑΝ, ΛΙΛΥΒΑΙΙΤΑΝ, ΣΕΛΙΝΩΝΤΙΩΝ*; all which words, inscribed upon their money, demonstrate the Doric dialect to have been then the language of those cities. 'Tis true there came some colonies to Sicily from Eubœa, and Samos, and other places; which, in those parts where they settled, might speak, for a while, the Ionic

or the Attic; and afterwards, being mixed with the Dorians, might make a new sort of dialect, a compound of both: as Thucydides[o] observes of Himera, that the language of that city was at first a medley of Doric and Chalcidic. But that is no more than what happened even in Greece itself, where there were many *ὑποδιαιρέσεις τοπικαὶ*,[p] *local subdivisions* of every dialect, one country having always some singularity of speech not used by any other. But those little peculiarities do not hinder us from saying, in general, that the Sicilians spoke Doric. For the other dialects were swallowed up and extinguished by those two powerful cities of Dorian original, Syracuse and Agrigentum, that shared the whole island betweeen them. Syracuse was a Corinthian colony, and spoke the dialect of her mother city.[q] Agrigentum was first built by the Geloans of Sicily, who had been themselves a plantation of the Cretans and Rhodians, both of which were Dorian nations. So that, upon the whole, though in some other towns, and for a time, there might be a few footsteps of the Ionic and Attic, yet our Sophist is inexcusable in making a tyrant of Agrigentum, a city of Doric language and original, write epistles in such a dialect as if he had gone to school at Athens.

But there is a learned Greek professor[r] (whose pardon I must ask, that I forgot to name him above among the patrons of Phalaris,) who, after he has asserted the credit of Euripides's *Letters*, gratuitously undertakes to apologise for these too about this matter of the dialect. First, says he, *because Phalaris was born at Astypala, an island of the Cyclades, where was an Athenian colony*,[s] that is one reason for his speaking Attic. It were easy to overthrow this first argument at once, by refuting our spurious *Epistles*, and by shewing, from much better authority, that Phalaris was a

[o] Lib. vi. p. 414.

[p] Vetus Auctor *περὶ Διαλέκτων*.

[q] Theocrit. Id. xv.

[r] [Joshua Barnes.—D.] Vid. Eurip. edit. Cantab. p. 523.

[s] Is enim Astypalâ natus erat, unâ ex Cycladibus, ubi Atheniensium colonia.

Sicilian born. But I may speak, perhaps, of that by and by; and I will have every proof I bring stand by itself, without the support of another. Let us allow, then, that Phalaris came from Astypalæa, (for so it is to be called); not that isle of the Cyclades, according to Stephanus,[t] but of the Sporades, mentioned by Strabo[u] and Pliny:[v] for this latter was nearest to Crete, whither Phalaris's wife and son are supposed to have fled, Epist. LXIX. 'Tis true, our late industrious Editors have discovered a new place of his birth, Astypalæa,[w] a city of Crete, never mentioned before by any geographer, situate in the 370th deg. of longit., bearing south and by north off of Utopia. And I am wholly of their opinion, that he was born in that, or in none of them. But because tradition is rather for the island, we will beg their good leave to suppose it to be so: and there, as it seems, was formerly a plantation of Athenians; and Phalaris, being one of their posterity, must needs, for that reason, have a twang of their dialect. Now, what a pity 'tis that Phalaris himself, or his secretary, did not know of this plantation when he writ the CXX. Letter to the Athenians, Ὦ σοφώτατοι γηγενεῖς Ἀθηναῖοι! What a fine compliment would he have made upon that subject of their kindred! If any one know an express testimony that there was an Athenian colony at that Astypalæa, he can teach me more than I now remember. This I know in general, from Thucydides[x] and others, that the Athenians sent colonies to most of the islands; and so that may come in among the rest. But what then? must the language for ever afterwards be Attic, wherever the Athenians once had footing? Thucydides says, in the same passage, that they planted Ionia. They had colonies at Miletus, at Ephesus, and most of the maritime towns of Asia Minor. Nay, the Ionians and the Attics were anciently one people, and the language the same: and

[t] V. Ἀστυπάλ.

[u] Lib. x. p. 488.

[v] Lib. iv. cap. 12.

[w] Vid. Vitam Phalar. et Indicem, edit. Oxon.

[x] Lib. i. p. 10. Καὶ Ἴωνας μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ νησιωτῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς ᾤκισαν.

when Homer[y] says, Ἔνθα δὲ Βοιωτοὶ καὶ Ἰάονες, by the latter he is known to mean the Athenians. And yet we see that, in process of time, the colonies had a different dialect from that of the mother nation. Why, then, must Astypalæa needs be Attic? and that so tenaciously, that twenty years living in Sicily could not at all alter it in one of her islanders? He was part of that time a publican, or collector of taxes and customs:[z] could not that perpetual negoce* and converse with Dorians bring his mouth, by degrees, to speak a little broader? Would not he, that aimed at monarchy,[a] and for that design studied to be popular, have quitted his old dialect for that of the place, and not by every word he spoke make the invidious discovery of his being a stranger? But what if, after all, even the Astypalæans themselves should be found to speak Doric? If we make a conjecture from their neighbourhood, and the company they are put in, we can scarce question but they were Dorians. Strabo[b] says, the island lies between Cos and Rhodes and Crete, μεταξὺ τῆς Κῶ μάλιστα καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρήτης. And that all these three used the Doric dialect, is too well known to need any proof.

But let us hear the second apology for the Atticism of Phalaris. He[c] defends him by the like practice of others that, being Dorians born, repudiated their vernacular idiom for that of the Athenians; as Diodorus of Agyrium, Empedocles of Agrigentum, and Ocellus of Lucania. So that though Phalaris be supposed to be a native of Sicily, yet here is an excuse for him for quitting the language. But I conceive, with submission, that this argument is built partly upon a vulgar mistake, and partly upon such instances as are quite different and aliene from the case of our *Epistles*.

[y] Strabo, lib. viii. p. 333. and lib. ix. p. 392. [Hom. *Il.* xiii. 685.—D.]

[z] Polyænus, Stratag. [* See Preface, vol. i. p. liv.—D.]

[a] Ibid. [b] Lib. x. p. 488.

[c] [Joshua Barnes.—D.] Sed nec ipse Diodorus Siculus, nec Emp. Agrigentinus, nec Ocellus Lucanus Doricè sed Atticè ferè scripserunt.

Ocellus Lucanus, the Pythagorean philosopher, writ a small treatise *Of the Nature of the Universe*, which has been several times printed, and is *ἐν κοινῇ διαλέκτῳ*, in the common and ordinary Greek. But, if I may expect thanks for the discovery, I dare engage to make out that the author composed it not in the dress that it now wears, but in Doric, his own country fashion. For I find it was agreed and covenanted among all the scholars of that Italian sect *φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ*,[d] *to use their own mother-tongue:* this was the injunction of Pythagoras; this was the *tessera* of the whole party; and those that know any thing of their story, will believe they would have lost their lives rather than have broken it. 'Tis most certain, if one had published a book against that injunction, he would have been banished the society. Besides, when Jamblichus tells us of this compact of theirs, he makes not one exception to it; which he could not have missed, neither from ignorance nor forgetfulness, if so common a tract as this of Ocellus had been writ in the Attic. Nay, we are assured that other pieces of this author were made in the Doric; as one *Of Law*, *Περὶ Νόμου*, cited by Stobæus:[e] the fragment begins thus; *Συνέχει τὰ μὲν σκάνεα ζωὰ, ταύτας δ' αἴτιον ψυχά· τὸν δὲ κόσμον ἁρμονία, ταύτας δ' αἴτιος ὁ θεός.* But, which is plain demonstration, four citations are brought by the same writer out of this very book,[f] *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς φύσεως*, *About the Nature of the Universe*, all which are in Doric, and not, as they are now extant, in the ordinary dialect.* The first of them begins thus, *Ἔτι δὲ τὸ ἄναρχον καὶ ἀτελεύτατον καὶ τῶ σχήματος καὶ τᾶς κινάσιος καὶ τῶ χρόνω καὶ τᾶς ὠσίας τοῦτο πιστοῦται*: which is thus extant in the vulgar Ocellus, p. 16.,[g] *Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄναρχον καὶ ἀτελεύτητον καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τῆς κινήσεως καὶ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦτο πιστοῦται.* The second, thus beginning, *Ἔπει*

[d] Jamblichus, Vit. Pythagor. 202.
[e] Eclog. Phys. c. 16.
[f] Ibid. c. 24.
[* See vol. i. p. 423.—D.]
[g] Edit. Cantab. [where *Ἔτι δὲ τὸ ἄν. . . . . τῆς κιν. καὶ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τῆς οὐσ.*—D.]

δ' ἐν τῷ παντὶ, extant p. 17. The third, Πράτως γὰρ ὕλα τὸ πανδεχὲς, &c.; thus extant, p. 21., Πρώτως ὕλη τὸ πανδεχές. The fourth, Παντελὴς δὲ φθορὰ τᾶς περὶ τὰν γᾶν διακοσμάσιος; extant in ordinary Greek, p. 31., Παντελὴς δὲ φθορὰ τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως. From which passages these two points are manifestly evinced; that Ocellus composed his writings in Doric, and so is falsely brought in for an excuse to our Phalaris: and, which is much more considerable, that this tract of his now extant is to be acknowledged for a genuine work; which hitherto learned men have doubted of, from this very business of the dialect. For we now see, by these fragments, that every word of the true book is faithfully preserved; the Doric only being changed into the ordinary language, at the fancy of some copier since the days of Stobæus.

As for Empedocles and Diodorus, a poet and an historian, their case is widely remote from that of our Tyrant. The former, being to write an epic poem, shewed an excellent judgment in laying aside his country dialect for that of the Ionians, which Homer and his followers had used before him, and had given it, as it were, the dominion of all heroic poetry. For the Doric idiom had not grace and majesty enough for the subject he was engaged in; being proper, indeed, for mimes, comedies, and pastorals, where men of ordinary rank are represented; or for epigrams, a poem of a low vein; or for lyrics, and the chorus of tragedy, upon the account of the Doric music; but not to be used in heroic without great disadvantage. And the historian likewise, with the rest of that and other Dorian nations, Philistus, Timæus, Ephorus, Herodotus, Dionysius Halic., &c., had great reason to decline the use of their vernacular tongue, as improper for history, which, besides the affectation of eloquence, aims at easiness and perspicuity, and is designed for general use. But the Doric is coarse and rustic, and always clouded with an obscurity; ἐχούσης τι καὶ ἀσαφὲς τῆς (Δωρίδος) διαλέκτου, says Porphyry,[h] who attribu

[h] Vita Pythag. p. 205.

decay of the Pythagorean sect to their writing in that dialect. And we have just now seen an instance of it; since somebody thought it worth his labour to transcribe Ocellus into another idiom. And now, what affinity is there between Phalaris's case and that of historians or heroic poets? What mighty motives can be here for assuming a foreign dialect? The *Letters* are dated in the middle of Sicily, mostly directed to the next towns, or to some of his own domestics, about private affairs, or even the expenses of his family, and never designed for the public view. If any will still excuse the Tyrant for Atticising in those circumstances, 'tis hard to deny them the glory of being the faithfullest of his vassals.

XIII. But since tyrants will not be confined by laws, let us suppose, if you will, that our Phalaris might make use of the Attic for no reason at all but his own arbitrary humour and pleasure; yet we have still another indictment against the credit of the *Epistles*. For even the Attic of the true Phalaris's age is not there represented; but a more recent idiom and style, that by the whole thread and colour of it betrays itself to be a thousand years younger than he. Every living language, like the perspiring bodies of living creatures, is in perpetual motion and alteration; some words go off, and become obsolete; others are taken in, and by degrees grow into common use; or the same word is inverted to a new sense and notion; which in tract of time makes as observable a change in the air and features of a language as age makes in the lines and mien of a face. All are sensible of this in their own native tongues, where continual use makes every man a critic. For what Englishman does not think himself able, from the very turn and fashion of the style, to distinguish a fresh English composition from another a hundred years old? Now, there are as real and sensible differences in the several ages of Greek, were there as many that could discern them. But very few are so versed and practised in that language as ever to arrive at that subtilty of taste. And yet as few will be content to relish or dislike a thing, not by their own sense, but by

another man's palate. So that should I affirm, that I know the novity of these *Epistles* from the whole body and form of the work, none, perhaps, would be convinced by it, but those that without my indication could discover it by themselves. I shall let that alone, then, and point only at a few particular marks and moles in the *Letters*, which every one that pleases may know them by. In the very first Epistle, ὧν ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις, *which you accuse me of*, is an innovation in language; for which the ancients used προφέρεις. In the XVII. προδεδωκότα, *having given before*, never used by the ancients in that sense, but always for *having betrayed*. In the LI. βουλομένην ἐμὲ διώκειν, *desirous to follow me*, where he speaks of his wife that would accompany him in his exile: but διώκειν anciently signified *to pursue*, when that which fled feared and shunned the pursuer.* In the CXLII., among other presents to a bride, he sends θυγατέρας τέτταρας ὁμήλικας, which would anciently have signified *daughters;* but he here means it of *virgins* or *maidens;* as *fille* and *figlia* signify in French and Italian; which is a most manifest token of a later Greek. Even Tzetzes,[i] when he tells the story out of this Epistle, interprets it *maids*, θεραπαίνας. In the LXXVII., πολλοὶ παίδων ὄντες ἐρασταὶ, *many that are fond of their children*, for that is his sense of the words; which of old would have been taken for *a flagitious love of boys;* as if he had said, πολλοὶ ὄντες παιδεραστάι.† They that will make the search may find more of this sort; but I suppose these are sufficient to unmask the recent Sophist under the person of the old Tyrant.

XIV. But should we connive at his using the Attic dialect, and say not a word of those flaws and innovations in his style; yet there is one thing still, that, I fear, will more difficultly be forgiven him; that is, a very slippery way in telling of money. This is a tender point, and will make

[* See p. 27. of this vol.—Lennep in his edition of *Phalar. Epist.* gives πρὸς δεδωκότα, p. 354., where see note: see also his note on the meaning of διώκειν in this passage, p. 114.—D.]

[i] Chiliad. p. 196. [=V. 915. p. 192. *ed. Kiess.*—D.]

[† See note, p. 24. of this vol.—D.]

every body shy and cautious of entertaining him. In the LXXXV. Epistle he talks of a *hundred talents*, *τάλαντα ἑκατόν*; of fifteen more, in the CXVIII.; eight, in the CXXXVII.; seven, in the CIV.; five, in the CXLIII.; and three, in the XCV. These affairs being transacted in the middle of Sicily, and all the persons concerned being natives and inhabitants there, who would not be ready to conclude that he meant the *talent* of the country? since he gives not the least hint of his meaning a foreign sum. If a bargain were made in England to pay so many pounds or marks, and the party should pretend at last that he meant Scots marks or French livres, few, I suppose, would care to have dealings with him. Now, this is the very case in so many of these *Letters*. In the LXX., indeed, he is more punctual with Polyclitus his physician; for he speaks expressly of Attic money, *μυριάδας Ἀττικὰς πέντε*. But this is so far from excusing him, that it is a plain condemnation out of his own mouth. For if it was necessary to tell Polyclitus that he meant the Attic money, and not the Sicilian, why had he not the same caution and ingenuity towards all the rest? We are to know, that in Sicily, as in most other countries, the name and value of their coins, and the way of reckoning by sums, was peculiar. The sum *talent*, in the Sicilian account, contained no more in specie than three Attic drachms or Roman denares; as plainly appears from Aristotle,[j] in his now-lost treatise of the *Sicilian Government*. And the words of Festus are most express; *Talentorum non unum genus: Atticum est sex millium denariúm.... Syracusanum trium denariúm.* What an immense difference! One Attic talent had the real value of two thousand Sicilian talents. Now, in all these *Epistles* the very circumstances assure us that by the word *talent* simply named, the Attic talent is understood. But should not our wise Sophist have known, that a *talent* in that country where he had laid the scene of his *Letters* was quite another thing? Without question, if

[j] ix. c. 6. [p. 1068. *ed. Hemst.*—D.]

the true Phalaris had penned them, he would have reckoned these sums by the Sicilian talents, increasing only the number: or should he have made use of the Attic account, he would always have given express notice of it, never saying τάλαντον alone, without the addition of Ἀττικόν.

XV. But, to let pass all further arguments from words and language, to me the very matter and business of the *Letters* sufficiently discovers them to be an imposture. What force of wit and spirit in the style, what lively painting of humour, some fancy they discern there, I will not examine nor dispute. But methinks little sense and judgment is shewn in the ground-work and subject of them. What an improbable and absurd story is that of the LIV.! Stesichorus was born at Himera; but he chanced to die at Catana, a hundred miles' distance from home, quite across the island. There he was buried, and a noble monument made for him.[k] Thus far the Sophist had read in good authors. Now, upon this he introduces the Himerenses so enraged at the others for having Stesichorus's ashes, that nothing less will serve them than denouncing of war, and sacking their city. And presently an embassy is sent to Phalaris to desire his assistance; who, like a generous ally, promises them what arms and men and money they would; but withal sprinkles a little dust among the bees, advising them to milder counsels, and proposing this expedient, that Catana should have Stesichorus's tomb, and Himera should build a temple to him. Now, was ever any declamator's theme so extravagantly put? What? to go to war upon so slight an occasion? and to call in too the assistance of the Tyrant? Had they so soon forgot Stesichorus's own counsel?[l] who, when upon another occasion they would have asked succour of Phalaris, dissuaded them by the fable of the *horse* and his *rider*. Our Sophist had heard that seven cities *contended* about Homer; and so two might go to blows about another poet. But there's a difference between

[k] Suidas, Πάντα ὀκτὼ et Στησιχ.

[l] Aristot. Rhet. l. i.

that contention and this fighting in earnest. He is as extravagant too in the honours he would raise to his poet's memory; nothing less than a temple and deification. Cicero tells us, that in his days there was his statue still extant at Himera (then called Thermæ), which one would think was honour enough. But a Sophist can build temples in the air as cheaply and easily as some others do castles.

What an inconsistency is there between the LI. and LXIX. Epistles! In the former he declares his immortal hatred to one Python, who, after Phalaris's flight from Astypalæa, would have persuaded his wife Erythia to a second marriage with himself; but seeing her resolved to follow her husband, he poisoned her. Now, this could be no long time after his banishment, for then she could not have wanted opportunities of following him. But in the LXIX. Epist. we have her alive again, long after that Phalaris had been Tyrant of Agrigentum, for he mentions his growing old there. And we must not imagine but that several years had passed before he could seize the government of so populous a city, that had 200,000 souls in it,[m] or, as others say, 800,000.[n] For he came an indigent stranger thither, according to the *Letters;* and by degrees rising from one employment to another, at last had opportunity and power to effect that design. Besides, in the LXIX. Letter she is at Crete with her son; and in the LI. she is poisoned (I suppose) at Astypalæa, for there her poisoner dwelt; and 'tis expressly said, she designed, but could not follow her husband. Which seems an intimation that the Sophist believed Astypalæa to be a city in Crete. 'Tis certain, our diligent Editors, by comparing these two passages together, made that discovery in geography;[o] for it could not be learned any where else; and 'tis an admirable token, both that the *Epistles* are old and genuine, and that the commentators are not inferior to, nor unworthy of their author.

[m] Diod. Sicul. p. 205.

[n] Diog. Laërt. in Empedoc.

[o] Vita Phalar. and Index.

What a scene of putid and senseless formality are the LXXIIX.,* LXXIX., and CXLIV. Epistles! Nicocles a Syracusian, a man of the highest rank and quality, sends his own brother an hundred miles with a request to Phalaris, that he would send to Stesichorus another hundred miles, and beg the favour of a copy of verses upon Clearista his wife, who was lately dead. Phalaris accordingly sends to Himera with mighty application and address, and soon after writes a second letter of thanks for so singular a kindness. Upon the fame of this, one Pelopidas[p] entreats him, that he would procure the like favour for a friend of his; but meets with a repulse. Now, whether there was any poem upon Clearista among the works of Stesichorus, whence our Sophist might take the plot and ground-work of this story, or whether all is entirely his own invention and manufacture, I will not pretend to guess. But let those believe that can, that such stuff as this busied the head of the Tyrant: at least they must confess then, though the *Letters* would represent him as a great admirer and judge too of poetry, that he was a mere *asinus ad lyram*. For, in the LXXIX. Epist. he calls this poem upon Clearista μέλος and μελῳδίαν, which must here (as it almost ever does) signify a *lyric ode*,† since it is spoken of Stesichorus, a melic or lyric poet. But in the CXLIV. he calls it an *elegy*, ἐλεγεῖον, which is as different from μέλος as Theognis is from Pindar, or Tibullus from Horace. What, the same copy of verses both an ode and an elegy? Could not some years' acquaintance with Stesichorus teach him the very names? But to forgive him, or rather the Sophist, such an egregious piece of dulness, why, forsooth, so much ado, why such a vast way about, to obtain a few verses? Could not they have writ directly to Stesichorus, and at the price of some present have met with easy success? Do not we know that all of that string, Bacchylides, Simonides, Pindar, got their livelihood by the Muses? So that to use Phalaris's intercession, besides the delay, and

[* = LXXVIII.—D.]

[† See note, p. 81. of this vol.—D.]

[p] Ep. lxv.

an unnecessary trouble to both, was to defraud the poet of his fee.

Nay, certainly, they might have employed any hand rather than Phalaris's. For, begging pardon of the *Epistles*, I suspect all to be a cheat about Stesichorus's friendship with him. For the poet, out of common gratitude, must needs have celebrated it in some of his works. But that he *did not*, the *Letters* themselves are, in this point, a sufficient witness. For, in the LXXIX. Phalaris is feigned to entreat him not once to mention his name in his books. This was a sly fetch of our Sophist, to prevent so shrewd an objection from Stesichorus's silence as to any friendship at all with him. But that cunning shall not serve his turn. For what if Phalaris had really wished him to decline mentioning his name? Stesichorus knew the world well enough, that those sort of requests are but a modest simulation; and a disobedience would have been easily pardoned. In the LXXIV. Letter he proclaims and glories to his enemy Orsilochus, that Pythagoras had stayed five months with him: why should he then seek to conceal from posterity the twelve years' familiarity with Stesichorus? Pindar, exhorting Hiero the Tyrant of Syracuse to be kind to poets and men of letters, tells him how Crœsus had immortal praise for his friendship and bounty to them, *but the memory of that cruel and inhospitable Phalaris was hated and cursed every where.*[q] How could Pindar have said this, had he heard of his extraordinary dearness with Stesichorus? For their acquaintance, according to the *Letters*, was as memorable and as glorious as that of Crœsus with Æsop and Solon. So that Pindar, had he known it, for that sole kindness to his fellow-poet, would have forborne so vile a character. Plato, in his second epistle, recounts to Dionysius some celebrated friendships of learned men with tyrants and magistrates; Simonides's with Hiero and Pausanias, Thales's with Pe-

[q] Pyth. i. *Τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυ | τῆρα νηλέα νόον | Ἐχθρὰ Φάλαριν κατέχει παντᾶ φάτις.* [v. 185. *ed. Heyn.*—D.]

riander, Anaxagoras's with Pericles, Solon's and others with Crœsus. Now, how could he have missed, had he ever heard of it, this of Stesichorus with Phalaris? being transacted in Sicily, and so a most proper and domestic example. If you say, the infamy of Phalaris made him decline that odious instance, in that very word you pronounce our *Epistles* to be spurious. For if they had been known to Plato, even Phalaris would have appeared as moderate a tyrant as Dionysius himself. Lucian,[r] that feigns an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi for the dedication of the Brazen Bull, makes an oration in his praise, as Isocrates does of Busiris; where, without doubt, he has gathered all the stories he knew for topics of his commendation: but he has not one word of his friendship with Stesichorus. Nor, indeed, has any body else. And do not you yet begin to suspect the credit of the *Letters?*

It would be endless to prosecute this part, and shew all the silliness and impertinency in the matter of the *Epistles*. For, take them in the whole bulk, if a great person would give me leave, I should say they are a fardle of commonplaces, without any life or spirit from action and circumstance. Do but cast your eye upon Cicero's letters, or any statesman's, as Phalaris was: what lively characters of men there! what descriptions of place! what notifications of time! what particularity of circumstances! what multiplicity of designs and events! When you return to these again, you feel, by the emptiness and deadness of them, that you converse with some dreaming pedant with his elbow on his desk; not with an active, ambitious tyrant, with his hand on his sword, commanding a million of subjects. All that takes or affects you, is a stiffness and stateliness and operoseness of style: but as that is improper and unbecoming in all epistles, so especially it is quite aliene from the character of Phalaris, a man of business and despatch.

XVI. It must needs be a great wonder to those that

[r] In Phalar. prior.

think the *Letters* genuine, how or where they were concealed, in what secret cave, or unknown corner of the world; so that nobody ever heard of them for a thousand years together. Some trusty servant of the Tyrant must have buried them under ground; and it was well that he did so. For if the Agrigentines had met with them, they had certainly gone to pot. They that burnt alive both him and his relations and his friends, would never have spared such monuments of him, to survive them and their city. And, without doubt, it was immortal vellum, and stolen from the *parchments of Jove*,[s] that could last for ten ages, though untouched and unstirred, in spite of all damp and moisture, that moulders other mortal skins. For had our *Letters* been used or transcribed during that thousand years, somebody would surely have spoken of them. Especially since so many of the ancients had occasion to do so: so that their silence is a direct argument that they never had heard of them. I have just now cited some passages of Pindar, Plato, and Lucian, which are a plain indication that they were unknown to those three. Nay, the last of these, besides the proof above named from his silence and pretermission, does as good as declare expressly that he never saw our *Epistles*. For, not to mention other differences of less moment, he makes both Phalaris and his smith Perilaus to be born at Agrigentum;[t] but the *Letters* bring one of them from Astypalæa, and the other from Athens. Lucian, then, knew nothing of them; or at least knew them, as I do, to be spurious, and below his notice. Much less could he be the author of them, as Politian and his followers believe; for he would neither have been guilty of such flat contradictions, nor have so forfeited all learning and wit, by those gross blunders in chronology, and that wretched pedantry in the matter. And whosoever those authors were that

[s] Διφθέραι Διός. [See Valckenaer's note on Herod. p. 400. *ed. Wessel.*, and *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 184 sq.—D.]

[t] Phalar. 1. Ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ τῶν ἀφανῶν ἐν Ἀκράγαντι ὤν. and ibid. Περίλαος ἦν τις ἠμεδαπός.

Lucian followed in his narrative of Phalaris, they too are so many witnesses against the *Epistles*. One can hardly believe, indeed, that the Sophist should venture to fetch his Tyrant from Astypalæa without the warrant of some old writer. But yet Lucian and his authors compel us to think so. And we find him as foolhardy on other occasions. Heraclides of Pontus, that lived within two centuries of Phalaris's age, says,[u] the Agrigentines, when they recovered their liberty, burnt him and his mother: but our Sophist makes him an orphan, ὀρφανίας πειραθῆναι;[v] which if any one shall contend to mean the loss of his father only, yet still he and Heraclides will not set horses together. For if Phalaris fled alone from Astypalæa, neither wife nor child nor any relation following him, according to the *Letters*, how came the old woman to be roasted at Agrigentum? Jamblichus[w] brings in Abaris the Hyperborean in company with Pythagoras to Phalaris's court: but our Sophist has writ a letter for him,[x] wherein he refuses to come. So little regard had he to fit his stories to true history: and I have had too much regard to him, in giving him the honour and patience of so long an examination.

I must now beg the favour of one word with our late Editors of this author. They have told the world, in their Preface, that (among other specimens of their diligence) they collated the King's MS. as far as the XL. Epistle; and would have done so throughout, but that the library-keeper, *out of his singular humanity*, denied them the further use of it.[y] This was meant as a lash for me, who had the honour then and since to serve his Majesty in that office. I must own 'twas very well resolved of them, to make the preface and the book all of a piece; for they have acted in this calumny both the injustice of the Tyrant, and the forgery

[u] De Polit. Ἐνέπρησε δὲ καὶ τὴν μητέρα.

[v] Epist. xlix.

[w] Vita Pythag. p. 183.

[x] Epist. lvii.

[y] Præf. Phalar. edit. Oxon. Manuscripto in Bibliothecâ Regiâ, cujus mihi copiam ulteriorem Bibliothecarius pro singulari suâ humanitate negavit.

of the Sophist. For my own part, I should never have honoured it with a refutation in print, but have given it the neglect that is due to weak detraction, had I not been engaged to my friend to write this censure upon Phalaris; where to omit to take notice of that slander, would be tacitly to own it. The true story is thus. A bookseller came to me, in the name of the Editors, to beg the use of the manuscript. It was not then in my custody: but as soon as I had the power of it, I went voluntarily and offered it him; bidding him tell the collator not to lose any time, for I was shortly to go out of town for two months. 'Twas delivered, used, and returned. Not a word said by the bearer, nor the least suspicion in me, that they had not finished the collation. For, I speak from experiment, they had more days to compare it in than they needed to have hours. 'Tis a very little book, and the writing as legible as print. Well, the collation, it seems, was sent defective to Oxon; and the blame, I suppose, laid upon me. I returned again to the library, some months before the Edition was finished: no application was made for further use of the manuscript. Thence I went for a whole fortnight to Oxon, where the book was then printing; conversed in the very college where the Editors resided. Not the least whisper there of the manuscript. After a few weeks, out comes the new Edition, with this sting in the mouth of it. 'Twas a surprise, indeed, to read there, that our manuscript was not perused. Could not they have asked for it again, then, after my return? 'Twas neither *singular* nor common *humanity* not to inquire into the truth of the thing, before they ventured to print, which is a sword in the hand of a child. But there is a reason for every thing; and the mystery was soon revealed. As for the King's manuscript, they had no want nor desire of it; for, as I shall shew by and by, they had neither industry nor skill to use either that or their own. And for my part, I, it seems, had the hard hap, in some private conversation, to say the *Epistles* were a spurious piece, and unworthy of a new edition. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.*

This was a thing deeply resented; and to have spoken to me about the manuscript, had been to lose a plausible occasion of taking revenge.

Pro singulari suâ humanitate! I could produce several letters from learned professors abroad, whose books our Editors may in time be fit to read, wherein these very same words are said of me candidly and seriously. For I endeavour to oblige even foreigners by all courtesy and humanity; much more would I encourage and assist any useful designs at home. And I heartily wish that I could do any service to that young gentleman of great hopes whose name is set to the Edition. I can do him no greater at present than to remove some blemishes from the book that is ascribed to him: which I desire may be taken aright; to be no disparagement to himself, but a reproof only to his teachers.

It is counted an ill omen to stumble at the threshold. In the very first epistle, to Alcibous, we have these words, *Ψυχῆς δὲ νόσον ἰατρὸς ἰᾶται θάνατος· ὃν ἀνεπαχθέστατον ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἀδικημάτων, οὐκ ἀκουσίων, ὧν ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις, ἀλλ' ἑκουσίων, ὧν αὐτὸς εἴργασαι, προσδέχου*: that is, *for a disease of the soul, the only physician is death: do you therefore expect a most painful one for those many and great injustices, not involuntary ones, such as you accuse me of, but voluntary ones, that yourself have committed.* Let us see now how our new Editors have managed this passage. First, they interpret *ἀνεπαχθέστατον nulli gravem;* meaning, I suppose, that Alcibous's death would be grievous to nobody. Which not only produces a flat and far-fetched sense, but is contrary to the rules of good language. For the Greek is in the superlative degree: let them put it then *nulli gravissimam;* and it will shew them the error of their version. It will be evident to such as know propriety of speech, that *ἀνεπαχθέστατον*, since no dative case follows it, must be referred to Alcibous, and to nobody else. I do not expect from our Editors much sagacity in way of critic; but though they could not of themselves find out the true reading, yet methinks they

might have embraced it when they saw it in the manuscript;* which reads it ὃν ἂν ἐπαχθέστατον, *a most grievous and cruel death,* meaning that in the Brazen Bull; which he calls in the CXXII. Epist. ὄλεθρον ἀχθηρότατον,† an epithet of the same root and signification. Ἂν in this place is an expletive particle, παραπληρωματικὸν, as the grammarians call it; which being a rare and quaint usage was the cause of corrupting the text.

The next words in the same passage, ἀδικημάτων, οὐκ ἀκουσίων, our elegant interpreters render *scelera, non invita.* And this we are to receive for one of their many improvements after the former translators.[z] Those old ones, good honest men, put us off with plain country Latin, *scelera, non præter voluntatem patrata,* and other such periphrases. For, as it was in their days believed, ἄκων signified *unwilling,* and was always meant of the agent; ἀκούσιος was *involuntary,* and generally meant of the action. And this latter, when it signifies the action, cannot be expressed in Latin by one single word. For *involuntarius* was not in use; and *invitus* is the same with ἄκων, and is always spoken of the person, never of the thing. So that if any body else had said *scelera invita, unwilling crimes,* some bold readers would be apt to take it for barbarism and nonsense; but coming from those great geniuses, with whom Learning, that is a leaving the world, has taken her last residence, they receive this as a new discovery in language, like another of theirs in geography.[a]

In the very next words to these, ἀκουσίων, ὧν ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις, let us see if they make any better work there. *Invita, ad quæ me hortaris; involuntary crimes, to which you exhort me,* says the version of our late Editors. Admirably

[* Boyle denies that any of the MSS. which he saw had this reading: see his *Exam.* p. 204. The King's MS. (which is now before me) certainly has, though Lennep doubts it, the reading stated by Bentley. Lennep gives ὃν ἐπαχθέστατον. *Phalar. Epist.* p. 310.—D.]

[† Lennep gives ἀχθεινότατον. *Phalar. Epist.* p. 28.—D.]

[z] Præf. p. 3. [a] Sup. p. 160.

well done again! Pray, how can this Alcibous, a Messenian, be said to *exhort* him to those cruelties, who so much abhorred him and them, (as it is in this very Letter,) that he had the physician his townsman tried for his own life for saving the Tyrant's? It would puzzle a common wit to reconcile this; but here's a note upon this passage, that will set every thing aright. *Ad quæ me hortaris;*] i. e. *Moribus tuis nequissimis provocas.*[b] Commend me to these annotators for a help at a dead lift. *To provoke a man,* we see, *with the basest tricks,* is, in their language, to *exhort* him. So that when they, by a vile aspersion, instead of thanks for a kindness received, have given me just *provocation* to answer them as they deserve, it is only, in their manner, to *exhort* me to do it. It is my *singular humanity,* that I do not follow their exhortation. But I am apt to believe, that even the Sophist himself, as illiterate as he was, would disdain to own such a version to be the echo of his meaning. Had he had in his thoughts so ridiculous a sense as they father upon him, he would have said then εἰς ἃ, or ἐφ' ἃ ἐμὲ προτρέπεις. For that is the syntax of προτρέπω, when it signifies to *exhort.* Whereas ἃ ἐμοὶ προτρέπεις (the ὧν in the text is for ἃ) is, in that sense, as absurd and incongruous in Greek, as *quæ mihi hortaris,* or *quæ mihi provocas,* would be in Latin. I think I have shewn already, that προτρέπειν is here ὀνειδίζειν, *exprobrare,* to accuse and reproach: *those involuntary wrongs that you lay to my charge.* 'Tis true the word is not used in this acceptation by any ancient authors. I have mentioned it therefore above, as a token of a more recent writer. But, without doubt, it was of known use in the age of the Sophist, and the innovation was not at all improper. For as the ancients, both in poetry and prose, used προφέρειν to denote this meaning,

*Γαστέρα μοι προφέρεις, κάλλιστον ὄνειδος ἁπάντων,**

so, by a like metaphor and analogy, we may use προτρέπειν

[b] Annot. ad Phalar. p. 145.

[* Suidas in Γαστήρ.—Diogenian. iii. 85. *Adag.* p. 205. *ed. Schot.*—D.]

to express the same notion: just as the Latins say *vitio* VERTERE. All this, I suppose, was known to the translator of Phalaris, who is commonly, but I believe falsely, supposed to be Cujacius; for he interprets it very well, *cujusmodi mihi objicis*. But that edition, and another of Aldus, though the two principal of all, and both of them in the public library at Oxon, had yet the odd fortune to lie all the while concealed from our late Editors that lived there.[c]

I was but just now in the mind to oblige them, by going through their whole book, and correcting for them all the faults that give offence to the best readers. But now that I cast my eye backwards, it makes me look as blank at the prospect of all that's to come, as Hercules did, when, after he had made a bargain unseen, he saw the stables of Augeas. For if the very first Epistle, of nine lines only, has taken me up four pages in scouring, what a sweet piece of work should I have of it to cleanse all the rest for them? I must beg their excuse therefore for the present; and shall only, to keep my promise, give one touch of their industry and skill in making use of the manuscript.

They have confessed to us they collated the manuscript to the XL. Epistle.[d] But, it seems, they could make no use of its various lections but in one single place, Epist. XXVI. It is writ to one Ariphrades, to caution his son to leave off plotting against Phalaris; *ἵνα, ὅταν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γένηται τῷ κακῷ διατείνων ἐν οἷς ἐστι, μὴ προσποιηθῇ δοκεῖν ἠγνοηκέναι*; *lest, when punishment overtakes him for persisting in his present courses, he pretend he had not fair warning*. But what now do our new Editors make of this? *διατείνων ἐν οἷς ἐστι* they translate *suam expendens conditionem*. This puts me in mind of the old Greek proverb, *that Leucon carries one thing, and his ass quite another*. For here's no affinity at all between the text and the version, which would every whit as well agree to any other words in the book. Even our Editors themselves seem sensible of this; for they give

[c] Præf. p. 3. [d] Præf. p. 4.

us this note upon it, *that* διατείνω *cannot admit here of any other meaning: and yet they find it no where else used in this sense.*[e] I dare pass my word for the truth of this latter part: to the former I shall say more anon. *So that,* say they, *the better reading is in the King's manuscript,* διὰ τίνων ἐν οἷς ἐστι, i. e. *for those things which he now does.* In the King's manuscript, which I have now by me, it was written at first διατείνων: but another hand has rased out the ε, as appears by the void space, and made it διά τινων. This corrector, whoever he was, though we know him from hence to be a sorry critic, yet he was a degree above our new Editors. For he made his τινων an enclitic; but they theirs an interrogative, as we see by their accent. Which in this place is directly against either common grammar or common sense, choose whether they please. But the genuine lection and meaning is, as I rendered it above; διατείνων ἐν οἷς ἐστι, *persisting and proceeding in his present ways.* So in the XXXIX. Epist. μένων ἐν οἷς ἐστι,* *continuing in the present station.* 'Tis true our Editors will not find διατείνων thus rendered in their dictionaries: but they may please to enlarge them then from this very place. For is not διατείνω exactly the same as the Latin PERTENDO? And is not *pertendo* to *persist and persevere?*

Verùm si incipies, neque pertendes naviter.[f]

Even the version ascribed to Cujacius has here the true interpretation, *persistens in proposito;* which I would advise our Editors to consult when they design to oblige the world by another edition.

This is all the use they have made of the King's manuscript: let us see if they have been more diligent in their own. In the XXXIV. Epist. the Tyrant tells one Pollux,

[e] Διατείνω alium sensum hîc vix admittit, in eodem tamen usurpatum nullibi invenio. Melius itaque in MS. Regio .... διὰ τίνων ἐν οἷς ἐστι, ... ob ea quæ jam agit. Annotat. pag. 146.

[* μενούσης μὲν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐν οἷς ἐστί.—D.]

[f] Ter. Eunuch. i. 1. [v. 6.—D.]

who wondered he was grown so recluse and difficult of access, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐνδεέστερον ἤδη φεύγω πάντας ἀνθρώπους; *nay*, says he, *I avoid company less than I ought to do, for I have found no faith either among strangers or friends.* Our new interpreters have given us here a cast of their critic; for instead of ἐνδεέστερον they venture to read ἐκτενέστερον, *ego jam* sedulò *omnes fugio*:[g] as for the former lection, they confess they know not what to make on't. Here are your workmen to mend an author; as bungling tinkers do old kettles: there was but one hole in the text before they meddled with it, but they leave it with two. For the fault is not in ἐνδεέστερον, but in ἤδη; which is to be corrected ἢ δεῖ: ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, *minùs quàm par est, minùs quàm oportet.* This is so very easy an emendation, that a small dose of sagacity might have found it out by conjecture. But what will the men of letters think of our Editors? will they commend their skill or their industry most? when I assure them, that all the three manuscripts which they pretend to have collated have it plainly and fairly ἢ δεῖ. Which fault will the Editors plead to? to make a public boast of collating three manuscripts, and yet neglect every one of them? or, to have observed in the manuscripts so certain a correction, without either knowledge to make use on't themselves, or ingenuity to communicate it to the world? 'Tis a bad business on either side; and yet it receives a great aggravation from this other which follows. Epist. LXVIII. Phalaris, to encourage his son's bounty; *I do not think*, says he, *you spend me too much money*, ἀλλ' ἐμαυτὸν ἐνδεέστερον εὑρίσκω ἤδη χρηστότητι παιδὸς ὑπηρετεῖν, *but I rather think I allow you too sparingly for so generous a son.* Here is ἐνδεέστερον ἤδη comes again. Now, every one of the manuscripts have it here too ἢ δεῖ: two of which, they pretend, in their Preface, to have thoroughly collated. And yet they take not the least notice

[g] Legendum forsan ἐκτενέστερον, quam enim interpretationem ἐνδεέστερον hic admittat, non video.

of this plain emendation, ἐνδεέστερον ἢ δεῖ, *parciùs æquo, parciùs quàm oportet;* but blunder on with the vulgar reading, and translate it, *But I find myself too poor to supply your liberality.*[h] Which, besides that it does not answer the words of the Greek, (which would then have been ἤδη, ἢ χρηστ.) makes mere nonsense of the context. For in the very next sentence he tells his son, *you shall sooner want friends to give it to, than I want money to give.* Ingenious translators! to make him complain of poverty, and in the same breath to declare that he has riches without end.

Let this serve for a short specimen of their care and skill in using of manuscripts. I have many more instances ready at hand; but their *humanity*, I hope, will pardon me, if I don't produce them now, nor now proceed, as I once thought, to weed all their book for them. My time does not lie upon my hands; and this tract must be only a short appendix to the book of my friend: but it's likely hereafter, if, in their way of speaking, they mightily *exhort* me to it, I may be at their service; if not in this, yet in another language: to carry the fame and glory of our Editors, whither such Editions as theirs seldom go, to foreign universities.

[h] Ego me pauperiorem invenio, quàm ut filii benignitati sufficere possim. [Sed meipsum pauperiorem, &c.—D.]

OF

THEMISTOCLES'S EPISTLES.

SIR,

I PRESUME I have been as good as my word, in detecting the cheat of Phalaris's *Epistles:* the other part of my promise was a censure of Æsop's *Fables.* But, before I meddle with those, I am willing, now that my hand's in, to examine some other impostures of this sort, out of the same schools of the Sophists. It will be no unpleasant labour to me, nor, I hope, unprofitable to others, to pull off the disguise from those little pedants, that have stalked about so long in the apparel of heroes.

The *Epistles* of Themistocles were printed first at Rome, in MDCXXVI., out of a manuscript in the Vatican. The editor, a Greek bishop,* believed them genuine; but there were some that suspected a forgery, as Leo Allatius[a] informs us; who himself leaves the matter in doubt; but withal observes in their favour, that nobody had ever said a word in print to prove them to be spurious. Suidas[b] is an evidence in their behalf; for, speaking of their reputed author, he says, *he has writ Letters full of spirit,* ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς φρονήματος γεμούσας. He, I think, is the only old writer that makes any mention of them. Which alone, as before in Phalaris's case, is a shrewd prejudice against their credit and reputation. Thucydides[c] and Charon Lampsacenus say, that Themistocles, when he fled into Asia, made his address to Artaxerxes, who was newly come to the throne; wherein

[* Caryophilus, archbishop of Iconium.—D.]

[a] De Script. Socrat. p. 78. [b] V. Θεμιστοκ.

[c] Lib. i. p. 90.

they are followed by Cornelius Nepos[d] and Plutarch, against the common tradition of Ephorus, Heraclides, and most others, that make Xerxes the father to be then alive. Some writers[e] relate that he had five cities given him by the Persian, others but three. Now, if the *Letters* had been known to any of those authors, both these disputes had been soon at an end, or rather never had been raised. For he himself expressly says,[f] it was Xerxes he went to, and that he gave him but three cities. Now, where could these *Epistles* lie, unknown and invisible, from Themistocles's time to Suidas? We must needs say, that the *Letters* had a worse exostracism than their author; since he was banished but for ten years, but they for a thousand.

II. 'Tis observable, that every one of the *Letters* bear date after his banishment, and contain a complete narrative of all his story afterwards, without the least gap or interruption. Now, 'tis hard to say, whether is the more strange of the two; that not one single letter of his before that time should be preserved, or not one afterwards lost, though written from so distant places, Argos, Corcyra, Epirus, Ephesus, Magnesia, from whence there was no very sure conveyance to Athens. What a cross vicissitude of fortune! while the author is in prosperity, all his letters are unlucky; and not one of them is missing after he himself miscarried. But the Sophist can easily account for this, though Themistocles cannot; for here are no letters before his exile, because the latter part of his life was the whole tour and compass that the Sophist designed to write of: and not a letter afterwards perished, because, being forged in a sophist's closet, they run no hazard at all of being lost in the carriage.

III. Themistocles was an eloquent man; but here are some touches in his *Letters* of such an elevated strain, that, if he did not go to school to Gorgias Leontinus, the Sophist

[d] Vita Themistoc.
[e] Plutarch, Diodor., Athenæus, &c.
[f] Ep. xx.

of that time, I can hardly believe he writ them. The historians tell us moderately, that, after he was driven from home, he was made much on at Argos; but he himself is all melting when he talks on that subject. He was met, he says,[g] on the road by two Argivans of his acquaintance, who, when he told them the news of his banishment, railed bitterly at the Athenians: but when they heard he was going to Delphi, rather than to their town, in a kind quarrel they tell him, that *the Athenians had justly punished him,*[h] since he so much wronged the city of Argos, to think of any sanctuary but that. Well, he goes with them to Argos; and there the whole city *teazes him by mere force* to take the *government* upon him,[i] taking it as the greatest *injury*, that he offered to decline it. These, you'll say, are choice flowers both of courtesy and of rhetoric; but there's another clearly beyond them, where he tells us, that he is so resolved of going to the Persian court, though it was a desperate risk, *that neither the advice of his friends, nor his father Neocles's ghost, nor his uncle Themistocles's, nor augury, nor omen, nor Apollo's oracle itself, should be able to dissuade him.*[j] Here's a bold resolute blade for you! here's your stoical *κέκρικα*! 'Tis almost impossible for a sophist not to betray himself. Nothing will relish and go down with them that is ordinary and natural. Then they applaud themselves most, when they have said a forced, extravagant thing. If one speaks of any civility, the compliment must be strained beyond all decorum. If he makes a resolution, he must needs swagger and swear, and be as wilful as a madman.

IV. The subject of many of the *Letters* is commonplace; mere chat, and telling a tale, without any business; an errand not worth sending to the next town, much less to be brought from remote countries some hundreds of leagues.

[g] Ep. i.

[h] Ἐπαινεῖν Ἀθηναίους, ὡς δίκαια τινόντων ἡμῶν.

[i] Ἀναγκάζουσιν, ὡς ἀδικούμενοι, ἢν μὴ ἄρχωμεν.

[j] Ep. xiv.

The xv. and xviii. Letters are written to enemies, his friends, I suppose, failing in their correspondence; and contain nothing but a little scolding, which was scarce worth the long carriage from Ephesus to Athens.

V. In the xx. Epistle we have this story: when Themistocles was at Corcyra, he designed for Sicily, to Gelo the Syracusian tyrant. But just as he was going a shipboard, the news came that Gelo was dead, and his brother Hiero succeeded him. Now, if we make it appear that Hiero was come to the crown some years before Themistocles's banishment and this voyage to Corcyra, what becomes of the credit of our *Epistles?* 'Tis true, the chronology of this part of history is not so settled and agreed,[k] as to amount to a demonstration against the *Letters;* but, however, when joined with the arguments preceding, at least it will come up to a high probability. Theophrastus, in his treatise *Of Monarchy*,[l] relates, that when Hiero had sent race-horses and a most sumptuous tent to the Olympian games, Themistocles advised the Greeks to plunder the *Tyrant's* tent, *τοῦ τυράννου*, and not to let his horses run. 'Tis evident, then, if Theophrastus speak properly, that Hiero was *monarch* of Syracuse when Themistocles was at Olympia; but it's most certain he never came thither after his exile.

But, to deal fairly, it must be confessed, that Ælian, in telling this story, varies from Theophrastus; for he says Hiero himself came to the games.[m] But that he would go thither in person, after he got the government, is wholly improbable. So that, if Ælian be believed, this business must have been done before Hiero came to the throne. For even in Gelo's life-time, who left him the monarchy, he kept horses for the race, and won at the Pythian games, Pythiad the xxvi.,[n] which answers to Olymp. lxxiv. 3. But, besides that Theophrastus is of much greater authority, the

[k] *Οὐδ' αὐτοῖς (χρονικοῖς) ἀτρέμα συνταττομένοις.* Plut. Them. p. 227.

[l] *Περὶ Βασιλείας*, apud Plut. Them. p. 225.

[m] Var. Hist. ix. 5.

[n] Pind. Schol. Pyth. i. and iii.

other refutes himself in the very next words. For he says, Themistocles hindered Hiero upon this pretence, *that he, that had not shared in the common danger, ought not to share in the common festival:* where it's certain by the *common danger* he means Xerxes's expedition, when Gelo either refused or delayed to give the Greeks his assistance.[o] This affront then was put upon Hiero after that expedition. But the very next Olympiad after, Hiero was in the monarchy.[p] It cannot be true, then, that his first accession to the throne was, according to the *Letters*, while Themistocles stayed at Corcyra.

Besides these inferences and deductions, we have the express verdict and declaration of most of the chronologers,[q] who place the beginning of Hiero's reign Olymp. LXXV. 3., and Themistocles's banishment seven years after, Olymp. LXXVII. 2. The Arundelian Marble, indeed, differs from all these in the periods of Gelo and Hiero; which would quite confound all this argumentation from notes of time. But, either that chronologer is quite out, or we can safely believe nothing in history. For he makes Gelo first invade the government two years after Xerxes's expedition. But Herodotus[r] spends half a dozen pages in the account of an embassy to Gelo from Sparta and Athens, to desire his assistance against the Persian. And 'tis agreed among all, that Gelo's victory over the Carthaginians in Sicily was got the very same day with the battle at Salamis.[s]

VI. The whole volume of Themistocles's *Letters* consists of XXI. only, and three of these are taken up in the story of Pausanias. The second is writ to Pausanias himself, before that Spartan's conspiracy with the Persian was discovered. There he exhorts him to moderation in his prosperity, lest some very great turn of fortune should speedily befall him. Can you desire now a surer indication of a sophist? Without doubt, he that penned

[o] Herod. vii. c. 163. Diod. xi. p. 21.
[p] Diod. xi. p. 29.
[q] Scholi. Pind. Pyth. i. Diod. xi. p. 29, 41. Euseb. in Chron.
[r] Lib. vii.
[s] Herodot. ibid. and Diod. l. xi.

this epistle knew beforehand what happened to Pausanias, who was soon after recalled home by the magistrates, and put to death for treason. The XIX. is to Pausanias again, but after his conspiracy was detected. Here he tells the particulars of that plot, as exactly as if he had been one of the Ephori that overheard it. Nay, he foretells him, that the Lacedæmonians would take away his life. Now, besides that Themistocles would scorn to insult so, and rail to no purpose, as this letter does, he would surely have had more wit than knowingly to write to the dead. For, at the same time he heard those particulars of Pausanias's treason, he must needs hear of his execution, since those things were not known till after his death, and the rifling of his papers. The VI. Epistle is a long narrative of the whole business of Pausanias; for that was a subject worthy of eloquence, and therefore was to receive ornament from the pen of the Sophist. But it was scarce worthy of Themistocles to send such a long news-letter to Athens, where, in all likelihood, the story was common before he heard of it himself.

But how shall we reconcile this affair of Pausanias according to the *Letters* with what Diodorus has left us upon the same subject? The *Letters*, we see, make Themistocles to be banished before Pausanias was suspected;[t] and make the one reside at Argos while the other was convicted and put to death.[u] But Diodorus, who has brought all his history into the method of Annals, places the death of Pausanias Olymp. LXXV. 4.,[v] and the exile of Themistocles six years after, Olymp. LXXVII. 2.[w] Now, I would fain know of our Sophist, how he came to dispose and suit his matters so negligently, to bring Pausanias upon the stage again, when he had been six years in his grave? I imagine he will refer me to Thucydides,[x] who makes an immediate transition from one story to the other; "That the Spartans "accused Themistocles, who was then banished from home,

[t] Ep. ii. [u] Ep. xix., vi. [v] Lib. xi. p. 36.
[w] Lib. xi. p. 41. [x] Lib. i. p. 88.

"of conspiring with Pausanias." This, indeed, might draw the Sophist and some others into a mistake. But it may be taken two ways: either that it was done presently upon the death of Pausanias; or a few years after, when Themistocles's exile gave the Spartans, that hated and feared him, an opportunity to ruin him. Plutarch follows the first way;[y] for he makes Themistocles, after his banishment, to have private dealings with Pausanias; in which opinion he favours the author of these *Letters*. But the second will rather appear to be the sense of Thucydides, if we consider that he places the matter of Pausanias just after the flight of Xerxes;[z] but when Themistocles went into Asia, he makes Artaxerxes to be in the throne,[a] which was a considerable while after. Besides that Diodorus, whose design was to refer all occurrences to years, and not to follow the thread of story beyond the annual period, is of more credit, in a point of chronology, than Plutarch or any other[s] that write Lives by the lump.

[y] In Themist. p. 224. [z] P. 63. [a] P. 90.

OF

SOCRATES'S EPISTLES.

THE *Epistles* of Socrates, and his scholars, Xenophon, Aristippus, &c., were published out of the Vatican Library by the learned Leo Allatius, and printed at Paris, MDCXXXVII. He was so fully persuaded himself, and so concerned to have others think, that they are the legitimate offspring of those authors they are laid to, that he has guarded and protected them, in a dialogue of LVII. pages in quarto, against all the objections that he or his friends could raise. And nobody since, that ever I heard of, has brought the matter into controversy. But I am inclined to believe, that, by that time I have done with them, it will be no more a controversy, but that they are spurious. I shall make use of nothing that Allatius has brought, except one objection only, and that I shall both manage in a new way, and defend it against all his exceptions.

I. The first Letter is Socrates's to some king, 'tis supposed to Archelaus king of Macedonia, in which he refuses to go to him, though invited in the most kind and obliging manner. That he really denied his company to Archelaus and others, we are assured from very good hands; which was the ground for our falsary to forge this epistle. But, I believe, none of those that mention it make so tall a compliment to Socrates as he does here to himself. For he says, *the king offered him part of his kingdom;* and, *that he should not come thither to be commanded, but to command*

both his subjects and himself.[a] Can you desire a better token of a sophist than this? 'Tis a fine offer, indeed, to a poor old man, that had nothing but his staff and one coat to his back. But a sophist abhors mediocrity; he must always say the greatest thing; and make a tide and a flood, though it be but in a basin of water.

II. Well; our philosopher goes on, and gives a reason of his refusal; that his demon forbid him to go: and then he falls into the long story of what happened to him in the battle at Delium, which was a tale of twenty years' standing at the date of this letter. But the Sophist had read it in Plato; and he would not miss the opportunity of an eloquent narration. I will not here insist upon the testimony of Athenæus,[b] that the whole business is a mere fiction of Plato's: let that be left in the middle. But we may safely infer thus much from it; that even Athenæus himself, whose curiosity nothing escaped, never met with these *Epistles.* Which alone creates a just suspicion that they were forged since his days, especially when the universal silence of all antiquity gives a general consent to it.

There's a passage, indeed, in Libanius,[c] which, in Allatius's judgment, seems plainly to declare that he had seen this very epistle. For, after he had mentioned Socrates's refusal to go to Scopas, and Eurylochus, and Archelaus, he adds, *Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐδεόμην τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, ἐν ἐκείναις τὸν ἄνθρωπον κάλλιστα ἂν ἴδετε.* Now, should we concede what Allatius would have, this is all that can be inferred from thence in their favour, that they are older than Libanius, which I am willing to believe; and that he believed them true, which I matter not at all. For so we have seen Stobæus, Suidas, and others, cry up Phalaris for a genuine book; and yet I fancy none of my readers are now of their

[a] *Τῆς βασιλείας ἔφης* [*ἔφησας.*—D.] *μέρος διδόναι.* and *Ἄρξοντα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ σοῦ αὐτοῦ.*

[b] Lib. v. p. 215. [= II. 329. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[c] Apologia Socrat. [Liban. *Orat. &c.* iii. 59. *ed. Reiske,* where *αὐτῶν ἐδεό. . . . . κάλλιστ' ἂν εἴδετε.*—D.]

opinion. But, with Allatius's good leave, I would draw the words of Libanius to a quite contrary purpose. After he had said that many princes had solicited Socrates, by letter, to come and live in their courts, and he answered them all with a denial, *But*, says he, *I want the* Letters *themselves, in which you might perfectly see the spirit of the man.* This, to me, is an indication that the *Letters* he means were not extant. For if he had them in his hand, according to Allatius, how could he *want* them? And 'tis plain he speaks here of several letters, being replies to several messages; but in this collection here's but a single one. *I wish*, says he, *the* Letters *were to be had; in those you might read his character.* If this be the sense of those words, as probably it is, Libanius is so far from being patron to our *Epistles*, that he is a positive witness against them.

III. The VII. Letter is writ by Socrates to one of those that had fled to Thebes from the violence of the XXX. Tyrants; in which he gives him an account of the state of Athens since their departure; *that himself was now hated by the Tyrants, because he would have no hand in the condemnation of Leon the Salaminian:* and then he tells the story at large. Now, here's a manifest discovery that the *Letters* are supposititious. For the business of Leon was quite over before those fugitives left the town. For Leon was murdered before Theramenes was;[d] and Theramenes was murdered before Thrasybulus and his party fled to Thebes. And that Socrates means them in this letter, 'tis evident from hence, that he speaks here of their conspiracy to resort privately towards Athens, and set upon the Tyrants; which afterwards came to pass.

IV. The VIII., IX., XII., and XIII. are Letters of jest and raillery between Antisthenes and Aristippus and Simon the shoemaker. 'Tis an affront to the memory of those men to believe they would fool and trifle in that manner; especially, send such impertinent stuff as far as from Sicily to Athens,

[d] Xenoph. Hist. lib. ii. p. 467, 470. Diod. l. xiv.

which could not decently be spoken even in merriment at a table.

V. In the XIII. Epistle, among the acquaintance of Simon he names Phædrus, the same that gives the title to the Dialogue of Plato; and the XXV. is writ by Phædrus himself to Plato; and both these are dated after Socrates's death. I will appeal now to Athenæus, if these two letters can be genuine. He, among other errors in chronology for which he chastises Plato, brings this in for one, *that he introduces Phædrus discoursing with Socrates, who must certainly be dead before the days of that philosopher.*[e] How comes he then to survive him in these *Epistles*, and discourse so passionately of his death? 'Tis true, for want of ancient history, we cannot back this authority with any other testimony. But I am sure, all those that have a just esteem for Athenæus, can have no slight one of this argument against the credit of the *Letters*.

VI. The XIV. Epistle gives Xenophon a long narrative of Socrates's trial and death, being writ presently after by one of his scholars* that was present at both. Among other particulars, he tells him, *that the oration or charge against Socrates was drawn up by Polycrates the Sophist.*[f] But I doubt this will turn to a charge against another sophist for counterfeiting letters. For I think I can plainly prove, that at the date of this letter there was no such report ever mentioned, that Polycrates had any hand in it; and that this false tradition, which afterwards obtained in the world, and gave occasion to our writer to say it in his letter, did not begin till some years after Socrates's condemnation.

Diogenes Laërtius brings Hermippus's testimony, that Polycrates made the charge.[g] *Συνέγραψε δὲ τὸν λόγον Πολυκράτης ὁ σοφιστὴς, ὥς φησιν Ἕρμιππος.* But, in opposition to this, he presently subjoins, "that Phavorinus,

[e] Lib. xi. pag. 505. [=IV. 381. *ed. Schw.*—D.] *Ἀδύνατον δὲ καὶ Φαῖδρον... κατὰ Σωκράτην εἶναι.*

[* It is given to Æschines in the ed. of Orell.—D.]

[f] *Ἦν δὲ (λόγος) Πολυκράτους τοῦ λογογράφου.*

[g] Vita Socrat.

"in the first book of his *Commentaries*, says, that Polycrates's oration against Socrates is not *true and real*, "because he mentions in it the walls built by Conon six "years after Socrates's death." To which Laërtius subscribes his own assent, *καὶ ἔστιν οὕτως ἔχον, and so it is.* I may freely say, that this passage of Phavorinus has not been yet rightly understood. It is generally interpreted as if he denied the oration that is attributed to Polycrates to be really his. But this is very far from being his opinion. For then he would be flatly confuted by Isocrates, a witness unanswerable, who, in a discourse which he addresses to this very Polycrates, tells him, *I perceive you value yourself most upon two orations, The Apology of Busiris,* and *Accusation of Socrates.*[h] But Phavorinus's meaning was, that Polycrates did not make that oration for a true charge to be spoke at the trial of Socrates, but writ it several years after, for no other trial than that of his own wit. The words in the Greek can admit of no other sense; *Μὴ εἶναι ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον τὸν Πολυκράτους κατὰ Σωκράτους· ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ . . μνημονεύει τῶν ὑπὸ Κόνωνος τειχῶν,* &c. Observe, that he says *μνημονεύει, Polycrates mentions:* if he had denied him to be the author, he would have said in the passive, *there is mentioned.* Besides, he expressly calls it *τὸν λόγον τὸν Πολυκράτους,* only denies it to be *ἀληθῆ.* But, if he had denied it to be his, he would have said, *Μὴ εἶναι Πολυκράτους τὸν λόγον τὸν κατὰ Σωκράτους*: as Laërtius speaks in other places; *Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτείαν, ἣν φησιν οὐκ εἶναι Ξενοφῶντος ὁ Μάγνης Δημήτριος;*[i] *Διαλόγους, . . . οὓς Πεισίστρατος ὁ Ἐφέσιος ἔλεγε μὴ εἶναι Αἰσχίνου.*[j] This, I think, is sufficiently clear. Now we are to know, it was the custom of the old sophists to make an ostentation of their art upon some difficult subjects and paradoxes, such as other people could speak nothing to; as the commendation of a fever or the gout. Polycrates, therefore, to shew his rhetoric in this way, writ an apology of Busiris, that killed

[h] Ἐπὶ τῇ Βουσίριδος ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ τῇ Σωκράτους κατηγορίᾳ. Isoc. Busir.
[i] In Xenoph. [j] In Æschine.

and eat his guests; and of Clytæmnestra, that murdered her husband:[k] and to give a proof of his skill, as well in accusing virtue, as in excusing vice, he writ an indictment against Socrates; not *ἀληθῆ, the true one,* as Phavorinus truly says, but only a scholastic exercise; such as Plato, Xenophon, Libanius, and others, writ in his defence. So that we are no more forced to believe that his oration was the true charge that was spoken at Socrates's trial, than that he really pleaded for Clytæmnestra when Orestes was going to kill her. Nay, it appears to me, from Isocrates himself, that it was but a scholastic exercise, and after Socrates's death. For he blames Polycrates for reckoning Alcibiades among Socrates's disciples; since, besides that nobody else ever counted him his scholar, had he really been so, he had been a commendation to his master, and not a disparagement, which was the aim of the Sophist. *So that,* says he, *if the dead could have knowledge of your writings, Socrates would thank you.*[1] Is not this a clear indication, that Socrates was *dead* before the oration was made? and that this was not the true charge? For then he would have heard it at his trial; and there had been no occasion to say, *if the dead could have knowledge of it.* In the close of all, he advises him to leave off shewing his parts upon such *villanous themes, πονηρὰς ὑποθέσεις,* lest he do public mischief, by putting false colours upon things. Here again we are plainly told, that his action against Socrates, like those for Busiris and Clytæmnestra, was but a declamation, a theme and exercise in the school, and not a real indictment in the Areopagus at Athens. To all which let me add, that neither Plato, nor Xenophon, nor any body contemporary with Socrates, ever once mention Polycrates for the author of the charge; which, had the thing been true, they would certainly have thrown in his teeth, considering the perpetual

[k] Quintil. lib. ii. cap. 18.

[1] *Εἰ γένοιτο ἐξουσία τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι βουλεύσασθαι περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων, ὁ μὲν χάριν ἂν εἰδείη σοί.* Isoc. Busir. [. . . . . *ὁ μὲν ἂν σοι τοσαύτην ἔχοι χάριν. Or. Att.* ii. 300. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

quarrel between sophists and philosophers. And 'tis well known that the Athenians, in a penitential mood, either banished or put to death all those that had any hand in Socrates's accusation. If Polycrates then were so eminently guilty as to draw up the impeachment, how could he escape untouched, when all the rest suffered?

But when the *Accusation of Socrates*, though only a sophistical exercise, came abroad in the world, it was natural enough, in some process of time, that those that heard of it only, or but perfunctorily read it, should believe it to be the real *charge*. We have seen already, that Hermippus was in that mistake, who lived an hundred years after; and with him Quintilian, Themistius, and others innumerable. Phavorinus, it seems, alone had the sagacity, by a notice from chronology, to find it of a more recent date than Socrates's trial. And even that very passage of Phavorinus has lain hitherto in the dark: so that my reader may forgive me this prolixity and niceness, since he learns by it a piece of news. As for Hermippus, lest the authority of so celebrated an author should deter one from so plain a truth, I will shew another slip of his, and a worse than this, in the story of Socrates. When Gryllus the son of Xenophon was slain in the same battle that Epaminondas was, most of the wits of that age writ elegies and encomiums on him, in compliment and consolation to his father. Among the rest, Hermippus says,[m] Socrates was one. Which is a blunder of no less than XXXVII. years, the interval between Socrates's death and the battle of Mantinea.

Socrates was put to death Olymp. XCV. 1., when Laches was magistrate. This is universally acknowledged;[n] and to go about to prove it, were to add light to the sun. And six

[m] Laërt. in Xenoph. [Ἕρμιππος ἐν τῷ περὶ Θεοφράστου καὶ Σωκράτη φησὶ Γρύλλου ἐγκώμιον γεγραφέναι. I. 113. *ed. Meib.*—"But Hermippus will be "cleared of this blunder, which Bentley imputes to him, if we restore in "Laërtius καὶ Ἰσοκράτη φησί." CLINTON'S *Fasti Hellen. from* CXXIV. *Ol. to Death of Aug.* (*App.*) p. 518.—D.]

[n] See Diodorus, Phavorinus, Diog. Laërtius, Aristides, Marmor. Arund., Euseb., Argumentum Isocr. Busir. &c.

years after this, Olymp. XCVI. 3., in Eubulides's magistracy, Conon repaired the walls.[o] Which gave the hint to Phavorinus, and after him to Diogenes, to discover the common mistake about Polycrates's oration. But Leo Allatius, to avoid the force of their argument, undertakes an impossible thing, to prolong Socrates's life above twenty years beyond Laches; so that he might see Conon's walls, and Polycrates's declamation be the true charge at his trial. Which he would make out, by comparing together some scraps of different authors, and some synchronisms of other men's lives with Socrates's. As if those things, which are only mistakes and unwary slips of the writers, could have any force or credit against so many express authorities. By the same way that he proceeds, I will shew the quite contrary; that Socrates died twenty years before Laches's government. For we have it from good hands, that Euripides,[p] in a play of his called *Palamedes*, using these words, *Ἔκάνετ', ἐκάνετε τὰν πάνσοφον*, &c., designed to lash the Athenians for Socrates's murder; and the whole theatre perceiving it, burst into tears. Socrates therefore died before Euripides. But 'tis well known that the latter died six years before Laches was archon. Nay, Socrates must needs be dead before *Palamedes* was acted. But that was acted Olymp. XCI. 1.,[q] which is sixteen years before Laches. Have I not proved now exactly the quite contrary to Allatius? But still I hope I have more judgment than to credit such an oblique argument against so many direct testimonies. If Allatius had looked round about him, he would not have

[o] Diodor. xiv. p. 303. Phavorin., Diog. Laërt.

[p] Diog. Laërt. in Socrat., Argum. Isoc. Busir. [The lines are read thus in Philostratus, *Heroica* (p. 168. *ed. Boisson*):

Ἔκάνετ', ἐκάνετε τὰν πάνσοφον, ὦ Δαναοί,
Τὰν οὐδὲν ἀλγύνουσαν ἀηδόνα Μουσᾶν.

On which see Valckenaer *ad Phœn.* v. 321. and *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 191. Boeckh thinks that they were added by some interpolator, when the play was revived after the death of Socrates, *Gr. Trag. Prin.* p. 185.—D.]

[q] Ælian. Var. Hist. ii. 1. Schol. Aristoph. *Ὄρνιθ.* p. 401. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 250.—D.]

committed so great a blunder, while he defends his *Epistles* at one post, to expose them to worse assaults. If Socrates died in Laches's magistracy, one epistle must be spurious, that mentions Polycrates. This breach Allatius would secure, and therefore he will needs make him live several years longer. But then, say I, if we concede this to Allatius, not one epistle only, but the whole bundle of them are spurious. For, most of them plainly suppose that Socrates died under Laches. Even this very epistle complains that Xenophon was abroad when Socrates suffered,[r] and that the expedition of Cyrus hindered him from being present then at Athens: and a second letter,[s] to name no more, dated after Socrates's death, makes Xenophon to have newly escaped the dangers of his long march through enemies' countries. Now, all the world knows[t] that Cyrus's expedition and Xenophon's march was in Laches's time, and the year before him. So that, upon the whole, there is no escape, no evasion from this argument; but our *Epistles* must be convicted of a manifest cheat.

VII. In the XVII. Letter, one of Socrates's scholars, supposed to be present at Athens when the things he speaks of were acted, says, the Athenians put to death both Anytus and Melitus, the prosecutors of Socrates;[u] which, being contrary to known matter of fact, proves the epistle to be a forgery. Melitus, indeed, was killed; but Anytus was only banished; and several writers speak of him afterwards at Heraclea in Pontus.[v]

VIII. The XVIII. is a Letter of Xenophon's, inviting some friends to come to see him at his plantation near Olympia. He says, Aristippus and Phædo had made him a visit; and that he recited to them his *Memoirs of Socrates*,[w] which both of them *approved* of.[x] This alone is sufficient to

[r] Ep. xiv. [s] xviii. [t] Marm. Arund., Laërt., Diodor. &c.

[u] *Ἄνυτόν τε καὶ Μέλιτον . . . . ἀπέκτειναν.*

[v] Laërt. in Socrat. et in Antisth. Themist. Orat. ii. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, viii. 3.

[w] *Ἀπομνημονεύματα.* [x] *Ἐδόκει ἁρμόδιά τινα εἶναι.*

blast the reputation of our famous *Epistles*. For, how is it likely that Aristippus would go so far to see Xenophon, who was always his enemy?[y] Much less would he have given his approbation to a book that was a satire against himself. For the book is yet in being; and in it he introduces Socrates, in a long lecture, reprehending Aristippus for his intemperance and lust.[z] Even Laërtius takes notice, that he brought in Aristippus's name upon that scandalous occasion out of the enmity he bare him.

IX. We have already seen Xenophon writing Socrates's *Memoirs* at Scillus, near Olympia. But in the XXII.,* to Cebes and Simmias, he is writing them at Megara, for there the letter is dated. And in the XXI.,† to Xanthippe, he invites her to come to him to Megara. One would think there was [were] more sophists than one had a finger in this volume of letters; or if he was but one author, nature gave him a short memory, without the blessing of a great wit. 'Tis true, upon Socrates's execution, his scholars left Athens for fear, and retired to Megara, to the house of Euclides;[a] which occasioned our Sophist to bring Xenophon thither too. But he should have remembered, that while they were scared out of Athens, for fear of their own lives, he was safe at a great distance, in the retinue of Agesilaus; from whose company he went to Scillus, without ever residing at Megara. Nay, the Sophist is so indiscreet as to bring in Xenophon in *forma pauperis*, to beg and receive relief from Cebes and Simmias; whereas every body knows that he got great riches in the war, and lived in very great splendour and hospitality at Scillus.[b]

[y] Ξενοφῶν δὲ εἶχε πρὸς αὐτὸν δυσμενῶς. Laërt. in Aristippo.

[z] Xenoph. Memorab. lib. ii. in princip.

[* It is given to Æschines in the ed. of Orell, where, at p. 244., see the remarks of Luzac on what he thinks to be the meaning of ἀπομνημονεύματα in this Epistle.—D.]

[† It is given to Æschines in the ed. of Orell.—D.]

[a] Laërt. in Euclid.

[b] Laërt. in Xenoph. Xenoph. Exp. Cyri, l. v. p. 350.

X. In the xxiv. Epistle, Plato says he is quite weary of a city life, and had therefore retired into the country, *διατρίβων οὐ μακρὰν Ἐφεστιάδων*; which Allatius translates *non longè ab Ephestiadibus.* He ought to have said *ab Hephæstiadis;* for the true word in the Greek is *Ἡφαιστιαδῶν.* Plato had some estate there, which he disposed of in his will: *τὸ ἐν Ἡφαιστιαδῶν χωρίον,* as 'tis in Laërtius.[c] Hesychius, *Ἡφαιστιάδαι, Ἀθηναῖοι.* Stephanus Byz., *Ἡφαιστιάδαι, δῆμος Ἀθηναίων* . . . . τὰ τοπικὰ, ἐξ Ἡφαιστιαδῶν,* &c. In the Roman manuscript of Laërtius 'tis writ *ἐνιφιστιάδων*; which manner of spelling is found also in Hesychius, *Ἰφίστιος, ἥρως . . . ἀφ' οὗ . . . Ἰφιστιάδαι.* If the reader does believe that our letter-monger, like Hesychius, spelt the word wrong, he will be satisfied of the forgery; for surely Plato himself knew the true name of his own estate. But if he incline to absolve the author, and lay the blame upon the copiers, he may please to accept of this only as an emendation.

XI. The xxvii. Epistle is Aristippus's to his daughter Arete; which perhaps is the very same that is mentioned by Laërtius, who, among the writings of this philosopher, names *ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς Ἀρήτην τὴν θυγατέρα.* Allatius, indeed, is ready to vouch it; but I am not so easy of belief. For here are two other letters[d] of his in this parcel, and both of them writ in the Doric dialect, though directed to Athens; because, forsooth, he was a Cyrenæan, and the Doric his native tongue. Pray, what was the matter, then, that in this he uses the Attic, though he writ from Sicily, a Dorian country, to his own daughter at Cyrene? One would suspect, as I observed before, that a couple of sophists clubbed to this collection. 'Tis true, we know from Laërtius, that, of xxv. *Dialogues* published by Aristippus, some were in the Doric idiom, and some in the Attic. But that, I suppose, was done because of the variety

[c] Vita Platon.

[* Ἡφαιστία, δῆμος Ἀκαμαντίδος φυλῆς. . . . . D.]

[d] IX. and XI.

of his persons. In some dialogues the speakers were Sicilians, and those were writ in the Doric; and where the Athenians were introduced, the Attic was proper. But now, in this letter to his daughter both parties are Dorians; and so this epistle should rather be Doric than either of the other two.

XII. In the same letter he mentions her estate in Bernice, *τὸ ἐν Βερνίκῃ κτῆμα*. There is no question but he means *Βερενίκη*; perhaps that city not far from Cyrene. But there was nothing then in all Afric called by that name; for *Βερενίκη* is the Macedonian idiom for *Φερενίκη, the victorious*. In that country *φ* was generally changed into *β*: as, instead of *κεφαλὴ*, they said *κεβλὴ*; for *Φίλιππος*, *Βίλιππος*; for *φαλακρὸς*, *βαλακρὸς*; and so in others.[e] So that *Βερενίκη* was unknown in Afric till the Macedonians came thither; and indeed they had their names from the wives of the Ptolemies a whole century of years after the date of this letter.

XIII. He goes on, and tells his daughter, *that if he should die, he would have her go to Athens, and live with Myrto and Xanthippe, the two wives of Socrates*. It was a common tradition among the writers of philosophic history, that Socrates had these two wives at once; and from thence our Sophist made them the compliment of a place in this epistle. There are cited, as authors of this story, Callisthenes, Demetrius Phalereus, Satyrus, and Aristoxenus, who all took it from Aristotle, in his book *Of Nobility, περὶ Εὐγενείας*.[f] But, polygamy being against the law of that commonwealth, and the story therefore improbable, Hieronymus Rhodius produces a temporary statute made in Socrates's days, that, by reason of the scarcity of people, a man might marry two wives at a time. But, notwithstanding such a flush of authorities, Panætius the Stoic,[g] a very

[e] Etym. Magn. &c.

[f] Laërt. in Socrat., Plutarch. Aristid., Athen. xiii. p. 556. [=V. 5. *ed. Schw.* —D.]

[g] Athenæus, Plutarch. ib.

great man, writ expressly against all those named above; and, in the opinion of Plutarch, *sufficiently*[h] confuted the tradition of the two wives. For my own part, I dare pin my belief upon two such excellent judgments as Plutarch's and Panætius's, and, upon their credit alone, pronounce this letter to be an imposture. What grounds they proceeded on, I cannot now tell; but I think there is apparent reason for rejecting the story, even laying aside their testimony. For none of Socrates's acquaintance, not Plato, not Xenophon, say one word of this Myrto. Aristotle, we see, was the first that mentioned her; but Plutarch suspects that book to be spurious.[i] So that all this tradition rose at first from a falsary, that counterfeited Aristotle's name. Besides, they do not agree in telling their tale: one says that he had both wives together; another, that Myrto was his first wife, and the second came after her death; another, that Xanthippe was the first. Let either of them come first, and our *Epistles* are false; for here we have both surviving him, and living together. One says, this Myrto was Aristides's daughter;[j] another, his granddaughter; and another, his grandson's daughter. Whatsoever she was, if she outlived her husband, according to the *Letters*, pray where was her ladyship at the time of his suffering? Xanthippe, like a loving wife, attended him in the prison;[k] but the other ne'er came near him. 'Tis a mistake, sure, that has past upon the world, that Xanthippe was the scold; it should seem that Myrto had the better title to that honourable name. But what shall we say to Hieronymus, who brings you the very statute that gave allowance of two wives at once? Panætius, you see, believed it not: and why may not a statute be forged as easily as these *Epistles?* If there was such an act, there appears no great wisdom in it. It is certain there is near an equality in the births of males and females. So that, if some men had two wives for their share, others must go without: and what remedy would that be against the scarcity of people? Besides that, by such a law,

[h] ἱκανῶς. [i] Ibid. [j] Ibid. [k] Plato, Apolog.

the rich only would be accommodated, who were able to maintain a couple; the poorer sort, who are always the most fruitful, would be in worse circumstances than before. And, without doubt, a very strong interest would have been made against the passing of such a bill; as we know what the Roman matrons did, when Papirius Prætextatus made a like story to his mother.[l] 'Tis very odd too that nobody but Hieronymus should ever hear of this statute; and he too a suspected witness, because he brings it to serve a turn, and to help at a hard pinch. But certainly such a political occurrence, had it been true, could never have lain hid from the whole tribe of historians. It had very well deserved not only a mention, but a remark. But how could it possibly escape the fancy and spleen of all the comedians of that age? how could they miss so pleasant an argument of jest and ridicule? Those that are acquainted with the condition of those times will look upon this as next to a demonstration. But let us grant, if you will, half a dozen wives to Socrates; yet, nevertheless, our *Epistles* will be still in the mire. For here our Sophist makes the two women live amicably together, which is pretty hard to believe; for (as those that make them two tell the story of them[m]), while their husband was alive, they were perpetually fighting. But, which is worse yet, there are other letters in the bundle that plainly suppose Socrates to have had but one wife. He himself, writing to somebody, tells him this domestic news, *that Xanthippe and the children are well;*[n] but says not a word of my lady Myrto. Xenophon sends a letter top-full of kindness and commendation to Xanthippe and the little ones;[o] but it was very uncivil in him to take no notice of the other, since, according to the story, she brought her husband the more children. Nay, if we allow this letter of Xenophon's to be genuine, he played a false and dirty trick, much against his character. For, at the date of this

[l] A. Gellius, li. i. c. 23.

[m] Aristoxenus apud Theodoret. Serm. xii. ad Græcos.

[n] Ep. iv. [o] Ep. xxi. [See note, p. 198.—D.]

epistle, if we believe the very next to it,[p] he was writing Socrates's *Memoirs*. So that, while he here in his letter wheedles the poor woman, and makes her little presents, and commends her for her love to her husband, and for many good qualities, in his book he traduces her to that present age, and to all posterity, for the most curst and devilish shrew *that ever was, or ever would be.*[q] Nay, which makes it the baser, he was the only man that said this of her; for neither Plato, nor any of the old Socratics, writ a word about her scolding. Which made Athenæus suspect it was a calumny;[r] especially since Aristophanes and his brethren of the stage, in all their raillery and satire upon Socrates, never once twitted him about his wife. Well, let that be as it will: but what shall we say to Xenophon's double-dealing? For my part, rather than I'll harbour such a thought of that great man, I'll quit a whole cart-load of such letters as these.

XIV. Xenophon, in the xv. Letter, tells this story of Plato, to whom he bore a grudge, that he should say, *none of his writings were to be ascribed to himself, but to Socrates young and handsome;* *Φησὶ μηδὲν εἶναι ποίημα αὐτοῦ, Σωκράτους μέντοι νέου καὶ καλοῦ ὄντος.* Now, this sentence is taken out of Plato's second epistle to Dionysius the Younger; *Οὐδ' ἔστι σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν, οὐδ' ἔσται· τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστι, καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος.* Here's a blunder with a witness, from the Sophist's ignorance in chronology. For his forged letter of Xenophon bears date immediately after Socrates's death; but the true one of Plato, which Xenophon here alludes to, is recenter by a vast while. For Dionysius came but to the crown Olymp. CIII. 1., which is XXXII. years after the trial of Socrates.

I must observe one thing more, that by no means should be omitted. There were formerly more epistles of Xeno-

[p] Ep. xxii. [See note, p. 198.—D.]

[q] Xenoph. Conviv. p. 876.

[r] Lib. v. p. 219. [= II. 343. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

phon extant than appear in this collection. A large fragment is cited in Stobæus,[s] out of his letter to Crito; two fragments, out of a letter to Sotira;[t] and two more, out of one to Lamprocles:[u] none of which are found here in Allatius's parcel. Theodoret produces a passage out of a letter of his to Æschines, wherein he jerks Plato *for his ambition and voluptuousness; to gratify which, he went to Sicily, to Dionysius's court.*[v] Eusebius has this passage, and more out of the same epistle;[w] and the whole is extant in Stobæus.[x] What shall we say? that the true letters of Xenophon were extant in those days? or that those too were a cheat, and belonged to the same volume whence these of Allatius were taken? And so, as I observed before, they will be older than Libanius's time. I am afraid it will be thought ill manners to question the judgment of Eusebius and Theodoret. But we know they have made other mistakes of a like nature;[y] and the very letter which they cite betrays itself to be a counterfeit. Xenophon, we see, reproaches Plato, in a letter to Æschines. If this were true, it was a most rude affront to the person he writ to, whose friendship he courts so much in the rest of his letter. For Æschines himself was guilty of the very same fault, and is wounded through Plato's side. 'Tis well known, that he too, as well as Plato and Aristippus and others, made a voyage to Sicily, and struck in with Dionysius, and that purely for money and the table.[z] Lucian says he was parasite to the Tyrant;[a] and another tells us he liked his entertainment so well, that he did not stir from him till he was deposed.[b] I would ask any man now, if he can still believe it a genuine letter, let him have what veneration he can for the learning of Eusebius?

[s] Serm. 81. [t] Serm. 120, 123. [u] Serm. 5.

[v] Ἔρως τυραννίδος, καὶ ἀντὶ λιτῆς διαίτης Σικελιῶτις γαστρὸς ἀμέτρου τράπεζα.

[w] Præp. Evang. xiv. 12. [x] Serm. 78.

[y] See Dissert. upon Jo. Malal.

[z] Laërt. et Suidas in Æsch., Plut. de Adulat.

[a] In Parasito. [b] Polycritus apud Laërt.

In the beginning of this discourse I have said, *that I heard of none that, since the first publication of these* Letters, *called them into question.* But I was shewn to-day (after mine was in the press), in Bishop Pearson's *Vindiciæ Epp. Sancti Ignatii,* a digression made on purpose against Socrates's *Epistles.*[c] I must confess, with some shame, I had either never read that chapter, or utterly forgot it. But I am glad now to find that incomparable man both to think it worth going out of his way to discover this imposture, and to confirm me in my judgment, by the accession of his great authority. There is nothing there disagreeing with what I had said, but that his Lordship allows the Epistle to Æschines, cited by Eusebius, to be genuine, which I had endeavoured to convict of a forgery. I refer it to those that please to read both, whether they think I have just reason to change my opinion; especially when I shall tell them, that not Æschines only, but even Xenophon himself, made a visit to Dionysius. I have Athenæus[d] for my authority, a witness beyond all exception. *Ξενοφῶν γοῦν ὁ Γρύλλου παρὰ Διονυσίῳ,* &c. *Xenophon,* says he, *the son of Gryllus, when at Dionysius the Sicilian's table, the cup-bearer forced the company to drink; Pray, says he, Dionysius (speaking aloud to the Tyrant), if your butler forces wine upon us against our wills, why may not your cook as well compel us to eat?* So that, if we suppose the letter genuine, the absurdity will double itself, both parties being guilty of the very same thing that is charged upon Plato.

[c] Par. II. p. 12, 13.

[d] Lib. x. p. 427. [=iv. 64. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

OF

EURIPIDES'S EPISTLES.

'Tis a bold and dangerous venture to attack Euripides's *Letters;* since a very learned Greek professor* has so passionately espoused them, that he declares it to be *great impudence, and want of all judgment,*[a] to question the truth of them. I do not care to meddle with controversy upon such high wagers as those: but, if I may have leave to give my opinion, without staking such valuable things as modesty and good sense upon it, I am very ready to speak my mind candidly and freely.

I. There are only five epistles now extant ascribed to Euripides; but without doubt there were formerly more of them; as we have seen just before, that we have not now the whole set of Xenophon's *Letters.* Neither can we suppose a sophist of so barren an invention, as to have his fancy quite cramped and jaded with poor five. We have here a peculiar happiness, which we wanted in the rest, to know whom we are obliged to for the great blessing of these *Epistles.* Apollonides, that writ a treatise *Περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας, About falsified History,* says, "one Sabirius "Pollo[b] forged them, the same man that counterfeited the "*Letters* of Aratus." This we are told by the writer of Aratus's life, no unlearned author; who does not contradict

* [Joshua Barnes.—D.]

[a] Perfrictæ frontis et [aut.—D.] judicii imminuti. Eurip. edit. Cantab. par. ii. p. 523.

[b] Σαβίριος Πόλλων.

him about these of Euripides; but for Aratus's, he says, that, bating this Apollonides, every body else believed them to be genuine. I cannot pass any judgment of what I never saw, for Aratus's *Letters* are not now to be had; but if they were no better than these of our tragedian, I should, in spite of the common vogue, be of Apollonides's mind; and I wish that book of his were now extant. One may know, by the manner of the name, that this Sabirius Pollo was a Roman; but I do not find such a family as the Sabirii, nor such a surname as Pollo. What if we read Sabinius, or Sabidius Pollio?

*Non amo te, Sabidi; nec possum dicere quare.**

If that Sabidius in Martial was the forger of our *Epistles*, though the poet could give none, yet I can give a very good reason why I do not love him.

But the learned advocate for the *Letters* makes several exceptions against the testimony of Apollonides. As, first, *that we may fairly infer from it, that a great many others believed them to be true.* Alas! how many more, both ancients and moderns, believed Phalaris's to be true! If that argument would have done the work, I might have spared this *Dissertation. But prove that these* Letters *now extant are the same that were forged by Sabirius.* Commend to me an argument that, like a flail, there's no fence against it. Why, had we been told too that he made Phalaris's *Epistles;* yet how could we *prove,* unless some passages were cited out of them, that they were the same that we have now? But though I cannot demonstrate that these are Sabirius's, yet I'll demonstrate them by and by to be an imposture; and I hope then it will be no injustice to lay them at his door. *But 'tis an evidence that the true* Epistles *of Euripides were once extant, because somebody thought it not improper to father false ones upon him.* Now, I should think the very contrary; that the cuckoo does not lay her

[* Martial. *Epigr.* I. 33.—D.]

egg where the nest is already full. At least, I am resolved I'll never go a book-hunting after the genuine *Epistles* of Phalaris, though somebody has cheated the world with a parcel of false ones.

II. It might easily have happened, though we suppose the *Letters* spurious, that, in so small a number as five, there could be nothing found to convict them by. But so well has the writer managed his business, that every one of them has matter enough to their own detection. The last and principal of them is dated from Macedonia, in answer to some reproaches that were cast upon him at Athens, for his going to Archelaus. *As for what you write from Athens,* says he, *pray know, that I value no more ὧν νῦν Ἀγάθων ἢ Μέσατος λέγει, what Agatho or Mesatus now say, than I formerly did what Aristophanes babbled.* Here we have the poet Agatho (for without doubt he means the poet, since he has joined him with Aristophanes,) residing at Athens, and blaming Euripides for living with Archelaus. Now, could any thing be more unfortunate for our Sabirius Pollo than the naming of this man? For even this Agatho himself was then with Archelaus, in Euripides's company;[c] besides that they were always good friends and acquaintance, not there only, but before at Athens.

But perhaps some may suspect it was another Agatho, a comic poet, that was meant in the letter, and not the famous Agatho the tragedian.[d] This I find to be the opinion of the learned person above named. But I will make bold to expunge this comic Agatho out of the catalogue of mankind. For he sprung but up, like a mushroom, out of a rotten passage in Suidas, who, after he has spoken of Agatho the tragic poet, has these words, *κωμῳδοποιὸς Σωκράτους διδασκάλου· ἐκωμῳδεῖτο δὲ εἰς θηλύτητα*: which his interpreters (Wolfius and Portus) thus translate, *fuit et alius Agatho, comœdiarum scriptor.* But there's nothing like *fuit*

[c] Ælian. ii. 21. and xiii. 4. Plut. in Apoph. Schol. Aristoph. Βατραχ.
[d] Vita Eurip. p. 29. ed. Cant.

et alius in the original, but the same Agatho is here meant that was mentioned before. This they might have known from the following words, *ἐκωμῳδεῖτο δὲ εἰς θηλύτητα, he was libelled for his effeminateness.* For whom can that belong to but to Agatho the tragedian, whom Lucian ranks with Cinyras and Sardanapalus?[e] Do but read Aristophanes's *Thesmophoriazusæ,* and you'll see him ridiculed upon that score for some pages together. The Scholiast upon *Βάτραχοι* of the same poet; *Ἀγάθων,* says he, *οὗτος τραγικὸς ποιητὴς ἐπὶ μαλακίᾳ διεβάλλετο.* Here, you see, it is expressly said, *Agatho the tragedian was traduced as effeminate.*[f] It follows presently in the same Scholiast, *Οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀγάθων κωμῳδοποιὸς τοῦ Σωκράτους διδασκάλου*; where we have the very words of Suidas applied to the tragedian; *οὗτος, this same Agatho was a comedian, Socrates being his master;* not *another,* as the translators of Suidas interpolate the text. But is it true, then, that our spruce Agatho writ comedies too? Nothing like it; though the learned Gregorius Gyraldus affirms it, from this very passage.[g] 'Tis a mere oscitation of our Scholiast, and of Suidas, that gaped after him; the occasion and ground of the story being nothing but this. Plato's *Convivium* was in the house of this Agatho: in the conclusion of which,[h] Socrates is introduced, proving to Agatho and Aristophanes, *that it belonged to the same man, and required the same parts, to write both comedy and tragedy; and that he that was a skilful tragedian was also a comedian.* Hence have our wise grammarians dressed up a fine story, that Agatho was a comedian, and of Socrates's teaching. And now, I hope, I have evidently proved the thing that I proposed, to the utter disgrace of our admired *Epistles.*

III. Euripides, we have seen, did not value one farthing *what either Agatho or Mesatus*[i] *said of him.* I would gladly

[e] Πάναβρόν τινα Σαρδανάπαλον, ἢ Κινύραν, ἢ αὐτὸν Ἀγάθωνα τὸν τῆς τραγῳδίας ἐπέραστον . . ποιητήν. Rhet. Præc.

[f] P. 133. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* 367.—D.]

[g] Dialog. de Poët.

[h] P. 336. Τὸν τέχνῃ τραγῳδοποιὸν ὄντα καὶ κωμῳδοποιὸν εἶναι.

[i] ἢ Μέσατος.

be better acquainted with this same Mesàtus, for I never once met with him but here in this letter. He must be a brother of the stage too, by the company he is placed in. But what was the matter? Was he so hissed and exploded, that he durst never shew his head since? I have a fancy he was of the same family with Phalaris's two fairy tragedians, Aristolochus and Lysinus:[j] and that these *Letters* too are akin to those of the Tyrant. But perhaps you'll say this Mesatus is but a fault in the copies. It may be so: and I could help you to another tragedian of those times not altogether unlike him; one Melitus, the same that afterwards accused Socrates; who was likely enough to hate Euripides, that was the philosopher's friend. Or I could invent some other medicine for the place: but let those look to that, that believe the *Epistles* true, or think them worth the curing.

The very learned defender of the *Epistles*, one of a singular industry and a most diffuse reading, has proposed some objections against the *Letters*, communicated to him by a private hand. That private person,* at the request of

[j] Epist. lxiii. and xcvii.

[* i. e. Bentley. The letter which he wrote to Barnes has been printed (with a few slight inaccuracies) in *Mus. Crit.* ii. 405. It is now given from the original, in the British Museum, *Add. MSS.* 6911. p. 34.

" SIR, " *At the Palace in Worcester, Feb.* 22, 169$\frac{2}{3}$.

" That the Epistles which are ascribed to Euripides are supposititious, I ever believed since I first read them, and 'tis likely shall continue to do so still; but as for *arguments* to prove them spurious, perhaps there are none that will convince any person that doth not discover it by himself. 'Tis always so, when there are no external proofs and testimonies to be had; but the verdict must be given from the intrinsic evidence. Then every man passeth his own judgment according to his genius and proficiency: and there can be no final determination of such matters without an infallible judge. A late ingenious author† admires the Epistles of Phalaris above any other prose in that language; and makes it an argument for the decay of human wit, because Homer and that work are the ancientest and the best also in their kinds. Now I would *ask him, what* dialect they wrote and spoke in Sicily?

[† Sir William Temple.—D.]

the Editor, imparted his opinion to him in a very short letter: to which he had no answer returned, till he found it, with some surprise, brought upon the stage in print, and his reasons routed and triumphed.[k] But let us see if we can

[k] Eurip. edit. Cant. p. 27. [xxvii.—D.] and 523.

---

and if Stesichorus (the supposed great acquaintance of Phalaris) did not use the Doric? I believe if this had come into his mind, it might have convinced him that they could not be genuine. But what if we had wanted this argument? there had been nothing else to be done, but to let him enjoy his own opinion *sine rivali.* If a man cannot perceive by himself that they are the work of some sophist, he may acquiesce perhaps in another man's judgment, but he cannot be convinced and understand that they are so. The sham Letters of Theano and Heraclitus may be detected the same way; for the first wrote in Doric, and the latter in Ionic. Well, you say, Euripides's are *purely Attic,* and therefore must not be rejected on that account. To wave any controversy about so nice a matter, suppose that they be so. So are Socrates's as much; those also ascribed to Themistocles and Diogenes; yet who can believe them to be really theirs? Neither will the Ionic dialect of those that are fathered upon Hippocrates and Democritus persuade me that they are genuine.

"All these are the forgeries and impostures of the Sophistæ: they searched a little into the history of the persons that they designed to personate, and so adapted their letters to their circumstances. This was in great credit among them, to follow the character of the person well, and suit the affairs of their times. A man got reputation by it, and it was owned at first by the true authors; but in time they were forgot, and the personated writers kept the titles. They made it an exercise to counterfeit thus, as much as Ovid did when he wrote Epistles in the names of heroes and heroines. So Mithridates tells you in the prologue to Brutus's Epistles, that he made feigned answers from the persons and cities that Brutus had wrote to; though any man that hath *νοῦς* and sagacity will perceive that there is a double and triple sham in that story: and, sir, as when I read a tragedy of Euripides, I could tell (without any knowledge of the writer) that they are but representations, and not the true actions and discourses of the persons in the drama, because I could know that men in those circumstances could not talk at that rate; so, methinks, by the very Letters themselves I presently discern that 'tis not Euripides himself that here discourseth, but a puny sophist that acts him.

"And it may be that those very passages from whence you take *arguments to overthrow Meursius* do give me my grounds of suspicion that they are illegitimate. As, that they are all written to Archelaus, Sophocles, and Cephisophon, which any pedant might know were persons concerned in Euripides's story, I take to be *magnum signum.* And for the argument and subject of them; in

rally them again: perhaps they may keep their ground in a second engagement.

IV. Our friend Sabirius Pollo, to make the whole work throughout worthy of himself, has directed this same letter

those to Archelaus we have *the refusing a great present of money*, and, instead of money, begging the *lives and freedom of some that were condemned to die.* Were not these and such-like the common themes of such scholastics and ἀρεταλόγοι? And 'tis pretty that those prisoners and their father, though the εὐγενέστατοι of their country, had no names at all, or else concealed them from their benefactor Euripides, so that he petitioned indefinitely for some *young men of Pella.* This Sophista was a great dunce: some service must be done to the Pellæans by all means, because he had read that Euripides lay buried at Pella; but why could not he invent some names for them, as easy as invent the whole story? But the Letter to Sophocles is most admirable. Sophocles his contemporary and ὁμότεχνος must certainly be a correspondent. But because they had no penny post at Athens, therefore a letter must be written to him while he was absent from thence. Now, he knew that Sophocles was one of the Athenian generals in the war with the Samians, and that he touched at Chios (in Athenæus, p. 602.), therefore thither a letter is directed; and let us hear about what? condoling that he had *lost some plays in shipwreck.* Alas, alas! so Terence lost an 108 plays in the sea, and himself too. But our sham author had forgot Sophocles's errand; that he was now the general, and not the poet; and if he had had some plays beforehand, he would not have carried them to the war; for I presume he did not use them, as our soldiers do quires of paper, for a defence against bullets. But why must Euripides of all folks be concerned for their loss, his antagonist and emulator? καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φ[θονέει], καὶ ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῷ. You may see a lampoon of one against the other in Athenæus. If these plays had been preserved, they would have been acted against those of Euripides, as many before had been: when sometimes one got the victory, and sometimes the other; and it was scarce thought a less prize to be crowned poet victor at the Dionysian feasts, than conqueror at the Olympian games. And the pleasantest of all is that τὰ οἴκοι ἴσθι κατὰ νοῦν καὶ ὅσα ἐπέστειλας ἐπιτελῆ ὄντα. It seems they are such very great cronies, that one commits the care of his domestic affairs to the other. *Mihi quidem non hercle fit verisimile*, as Davus says. But have we any better luck in the letter to Cephisophon out of Macedonia? This Cephisophon was thought once to help Euripides in writing plays; but at last he was taken in bed with his wife: for which poor Euripides was so jeered upon the stage by the comedians, that it is thought for this very reason he left Athens, and went to Archelaus. And yet this Cephisophon must be the man that he corresponds with from thence. And the worthy occasion of writing is, to justify *his leaving Athens* against the calumnies of his enemies. And what have we here, but more *refusing of money*, some thousands of pounds; some *stuff against covetousness*, &c. ἐκ ληκύθου τῶν σοφιστῶν; the *prating of Aristophanes against him* (ay, to be sure, do not omit that),

to Cephisophon, who was Euripides's actor for his plays. For he had often heard of Cephisophon, and so he would not let him pass without a share in his *Epistles*. But he should have minded time and history a little better, if he hoped to put himself upon us for the author he mimics. 'Tis true Cephisophon and our poet were once mighty dear acquaintance: but there fell out a foul accident, that broke off the friendship. For Euripides caught him acting for him, not upon the stage, but in private with his wife. Which business taking wind abroad, and making a perpetual jest, was one of the main reasons why he left Athens, and went to Macedonia. And is it likely, after all this, that our poet should write a letter to him, as soon as he got thither? that he should use him as his most intimate friend, nearer to him than his own children? I know there are some so fond of our *Epistles*, that *they value all this as nothing*. Cephisophon is so much in their books, that, whatsoever is said against him, must be calumny and detraction. Give me an advocate that will stick close, and hang upon a cause. By being their Editor, he is retained for the *Letters*, and

that surely he *cannot desire riches* now, when his *own dear mother was dead*, (ay, there's an argument indeed; it would have been all for the sake of gammer Clito the old herb-woman); and, good man, it forebodes him that he shall *lay his bones* ἐν γῇ βαρβάρῳ, and never see Athens again. Well done, Sophist, thou knewest that he was worried there by a pack of hounds, and so wouldst give us that hint.

"But, sir, you now see what I said at first, that I believe indeed that they are spurious Letters; but arguments to convince another man I have none. Therefore, when you confute Meursius, I desire that you would not name me; for I do not pretend to assert, but only to believe, they are shams. I am glad to hear all the fragments are prepared: they will make a little folio themselves, and will much commend your edition. Sir, I am yours to command,

"RICH. BENTLEY.

"Sir, I am very glad, if any thing that I have published can be serviceable to your design: and shall count it an honour to be mentioned in so great a work. Papers ready, I have none, and I cannot here make any review, being absent from my books of that kind, and engaged in other affairs: and 'tis likely yourself may have prevented me in most things. So that I can only wish you good success." D.]

therefore he must not desert his client. But why shall no testimony be allowed that touches Cephisophon? Are not Aristophanes and his commentator,[l] and Suidas, and Thomas Magister,[m] all lawful and good evidence? And is there one single witness against them, in his behalf? Not a writer is now extant that mentions his name, but what tells the story of him; and if we must not believe them, we shall want new evidence to prove there ever was such a man.

V. In a disquisition of this nature, an inconsistency in time and place is an argument that reaches every body. All will cry out, that Phalaris, &c. are spurious, when they see such breaches upon chronology. But, I must profess, I should as fully have believed them so, though the writers had escaped all mistakes of that kind. For, as they were commonly men of small endowments that affected to make these forgeries, a great man disdaining so base and ignoble a work; so they did their business accordingly, and expressed rather themselves than those they acted. For they knew not how to observe decorum in a quality so different from their own; like the silly player that would represent Hercules, tall indeed, but slender, without bulk and substance. Let us see the conduct of this author. In the first letter, Archelaus sends Euripides some money; and our poet, as if his profession were like a monastic vow of poverty, *utterly refuses it*. And why, forsooth, does he refuse it? Why, *it was too great a sum for his condition*. Yes, to be sure; when a sophist makes a present, the greatest sum costs no more than the least. *But it was difficult to be kept, and the fingers of thieves would itch at it*. Alas, for him! with the expense of one bag, out of many, he might have provided a strong box, and new doors and locks to his house. But why could he not accept a little of it? Even Socrates himself, and Xenocrates, took a modicum out of presents, and returned the rest again.[n] And is a poet more self-denying

[l] P. 167, 184.
[m] In Vitâ Eurip.
[n] Laërtius, in Socrat. et Xenoc.

than the most mortified of the philosophers? But the best of all is, *that Clito, the king's chief minister, threatened to be angry with him, if he refused it.* What, could Clito expect beforehand that the present would be refused? The most sagacious statesman, sure, that ever monarch was blest with! Alexander could not foresee such a thing; but was mightily surprised when Xenocrates would not receive some money that he sent him: "What," says he, "has Xenocrates no "friends to give it to, if he need it not himself?"[o] As for our poet, he had friends, I assure you, but all of his own kidney, *men of contentment, that would not finger a penny of it, τὸ αὔταρκες ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις παρόν.* What would one give to purchase a set of such acquaintance? And yet, I know not how, in the fifth letter their appetites were come to 'em; for in that, Euripides himself, from Archelaus's court, shared some presents among them; and we hear not one word but that all was well taken.

VI. The rest of this letter is employed in begging pardon *for the two sons of a Pellæan old fellow,*[p] who had done something to deserve imprisonment. And the third and fourth are commonplaces of thanks for granting this request. Now, besides that the whole business has the air and visage of sophistry, for this same is a mighty topic too in Phalaris's *Epistles,* 'tis a plain violation of good sense to petition for a man without telling his name: as if Pella, the royal city, had no old man in it but one. How can such an address be real? But to this they give a double answer; *that a sophist, if this was one, could not be at a loss for a name: he might easily have put one here; as hereafter he names Amphias, Lapretes, and others.* But the point is not, what he *might* have done, but what he *has* done. He *might* have named some other poet at Athens, and not Agatho, that was then in Macedonia. All those mistakes and blunders, of Phalaris and the rest, *might* easily have been avoided, had the writers had more history and discretion. *But he had*

[o] Plut. Apoph.

[p] Πελλαῖος γέρων.

writ a letter before this,[q] *about the same business; and there, we must suppose, he had mentioned his name.* This indeed would be something, if it would carry water. But, though the Sophist has told you so, do not rashly believe him. For it is plain, that pretended letter must have been sent to Archelaus before this vast present came from him. Why then did not the same messenger that brought the money bring the grant too of his petition? Would the king, that did him this mighty honour and kindness, deny him at the same time that small and just request? For the crime of those prisoners was surely no heinous business. Had it been a design to assassinate the king, he would never have interceded for them. The charge against them was a venial fault; or, were it the blackest accusation, their innocence at least would clear them; for our poet himself tells us *they had done nobody any wrong.*[r]

VII. The second Epistle is to Sophocles, whom he makes to be shipwrecked at the island Chios; the vessel and goods being lost, but all the men saved. That Sophocles was at Chios, we are informed by Ion Chius the tragedian,[s] who relates a long conversation of his there. If our author here means the same voyage, as probably he does, he is convicted of a cheat. For then Sophocles was commander of a fleet with Pericles in the Samian war, and went to Chios, and thence to Lesbos, for auxiliary forces.[t] But our mock Euripides never thinks of his public employment; but advises him to return home at his leisure, as if it had been a voyage for diversion. *Yes,* says his advocate, *but why might he not be at Chios another time, though nobody speak of it, about private affairs?* Yes; why not indeed? For Sophocles was so courteous and good-natured a man,[u] that, to do our letter-monger a kindness, he would have gone to every island in the Archipelago. But 'tis hard

[q] Πρότερον ἐπεστείλαμέν σοι.

[r] Οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖν ἐοίκασιν.

[s] Athen. xiii. 603. [V. 185. *ed Schw.*—D.]

[t] Ibid. and Thucyd. i. 75.

[u] Ion Chius, ib. Aristoph. Ranis.

though, that a good ship must be lost, and our poet swim for't, to oblige the little Sophist. For I fear the vessel was cast away purely to bring in *the great loss of Sophocles's plays.*[v] Alas, alas! Could he not go over the water, but he must needs take his plays with him? And must Euripides, of all men, lament the loss of them, whose own plays must, probably, have truckled to them at the next feast of Bacchus? Must Euripides, his rival, his antagonist, tell him, *that his orders about family affairs were executed;*[w] as if he had been employed by him as steward of his household?

VIII. The fifth Letter is a long apology for his going to Macedonia. "Can they think," says he, "that I came "hither for love of money? I should have come then "when I was younger, and not now, to lay my bones in "a barbarous country,[x] and make Archelaus richer by my "death." I observed it as no small mark of a sophist, that our author foretells he was to die in Macedonia, where, we know, he was worried to death by a pack of dogs. *But what wonder,* say they, *if an old man of seventy predict his own death?* I do not question but our poet might presage himself to be mortal. But 'twas an odd guess, to hit upon the time and place when and where he was to die. For what ground was there to be so positive? The letter, we see, carries date just after his arrival at court. He had, as yet, had very short trial whether all things would continue to his liking. And we have no reason to suppose that he came thither for good and all, never to see Athens again. Might he not, by some accident, or supplanted by some rival, lose the king's favour? Or, was he sure his life would last as long as his own? 'Twas a violent death, and not mere age and craziness, that took our poet away at last: and he knew Sophocles to be then alive and hearty, and making of plays still, that was fourteen years older than himself. In these circumstances, to be so positive about his

[v] Ἡ περὶ τὰ δράματα συμφορά.

[w] Τὰ οἴκοι ἴσθι κατὰ νοῦν . . . ὄντα.

[x] Ἵνα ἐν βαρβάρῳ γῇ ἀποθάνωμεν.

dying there, was a prophecy as bold as any of the Pythian Oracle. *But*, say they, *he gives a hint too, that Archelaus might be deposed: which a sophist would not say, because it never came to pass.* That was true, and came to pass every day, that he *might* be deposed: and he does not suggest that it actually would be so; for he expressly says, *God would always stand by the king, and support him.*[y] But indeed, as they interpret a passage there,* it looks as if he had foreboded real mischief; *Οὐδὲ ἀνιάσῃ, ὅτι οἴχεται ὁ καιρὸς εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν, ἀνεθεὶς φροῦδος ἤδη.* Which last words they translate *ubi jam destitutus fueris et abdicatus,* "when you are deserted and deposed." But, with all due submission, I will assume the freedom of changing the version. For *ἀνεθεὶς* and *φροῦδος* belong to the word *καιρὸς*, and not to Archelaus: and the distinction is to be put thus; *ὅτι οἴχεται ὁ καιρὸς, εἰς ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν ἀνεθεὶς, φροῦδος ἤδη, tempus ad exercendam benignitatem concessum;* "You will not grieve that the time "is gone past recalling, which was granted you by God to "do good to mankind in." This, I suppose, is now clear enough, and Archelaus is in no danger of being deposed by this sentence. But let us examine our author's next words; *to make Archelaus richer by my death.*[z] A very good thought indeed, and worthy of Euripides. But pray, what could the king get by his death? Would the poet be compelled to make him his heir, as some were forced by the Roman emperors? Or, would the king seize upon his estate, and defraud the true inheritor? If the poet had such suspicions as these, he would never have gone to him. But though he had left all to him at his death, what would the king have been richer for him? For surely Euripides, having settled affairs at home, carried no great stock with him to Macedonia, unless he thought Archelaus would make him pay for his board. He might well expect to be maintained by the

[y] Παρέσται μὲν ἀεὶ (ὁ θεὸς), καὶ στήσεται κατόπιν. [Ep. iv.—D.]

[* In Ep. iv.—D.]

[z] Ἵνα πλείονα Ἀρχελάῳ καταλίποιμεν χρήματα. [Ep. v.—D.]

king's liberality; as he found it in the event.[a] The king, therefore, were he his sole heir, would only have received again what himself had given before. Nay, even a great part of that had been lost beyond recovery. For our poet, by the very first messenger, had packed more away to Athens, that Archelaus had given him, than all that he carried with him could amount to, perhaps than all he was worth before.

IX. But he has more still to say to those that blamed him for leaving Athens. "If riches," says he, "could "draw me to Macedonia, why did I refuse *these very same* "*riches*[b] when I was *young* or *middle-aged*,[c] and while my "mother was alive, for whose sake alone, if at all, I should "have desired to be rich?" He alludes here to the first Letter (and perhaps to others now lost), where he refuses an ample sum of money sent him by Archelaus. Alas, poor Sophist! 'twas ill luck he took none of the money, to fee his advocates lustily; for this is like to be a hard brush. For how could the poet, while young or middle-aged, refuse presents from Archelaus? since, according to most chronologers,[d] he was about seventy, and, by the most favourable account, above sixty, when Archelaus came to the crown.

X. But what a dutiful child had mother Clito the herb-woman! *For her sake alone her son Euripides could wish to be rich*, to buy her oil to her salads. But what had the old gentleman the father done, that he wishes nothing for his sake? And how had his three sons[e] offended him, that they have no share in his good wishes? 'Tis a fine piece of conduct that our Sophist has shewn. He had read something of our poet's mother, for she was famous in old comedy for her lettuce and cabbage; but having heard nothing of his sons, he represents him, through all his

[a] Ep. v.

[b] Τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον πλοῦτον. [Ep. v.—D.]

[c] Νέοι τε καὶ μέσοι τὴν ἡλικίαν.

[d] Diod. Sicul. et alii apûd Athen. l. v. p. 217. [= II. 337. *ed. Schw.*—D.]

[e] Suidas, Tho. Magister, &c.

Letters, as if he had no children. As here, the only motive to desire wealth is his care of the *old woman;* and when she is supposed to be dead, all his concern is only for his *friends*. In the first Letter, he and his friends[f] are such contented men, that they refuse the royal gift. Not a word of the three young sparks, who, 'tis hard to think, were so self-denying. In the fifth, he keeps none of the king's presents by him, but sends all away to Athens, to be shared among his friends and companions.[g] How, again, would the young gentlemen look, to be forgot thus by their own father? If it be suspected, in favour of the *Letters*, that the sons might be all dead before, I can soon put a stop to that, from a good evidence, Aristophanes, who, in a play made the very year of our poet's death, mentions the sons as then alive.[h]

XI. The Romans may brag, as much as they please, of Mecænas and others; but of all patrons of learning, Archelaus of Macedonia shall have my commendations. Within two or three days after Euripides's arrival, he makes him a present of *forty talents*.[i] Which was a greater sum of money than our poet could ever have raised before, though all that he had should have been sold four times over. The great Themistocles was not worth three talents before he meddled with public affairs;[j] and two talents was thought a good portion for a substantial man's daughter.[k] Alexander the Great, when he was lord of the world, sent Xenocrates the philosopher a present of thirty talents, or, as others say, fifty, which Cicero calls a vast sum, especially for those times.[l] But Alexander's natural munificence was stimulated and exalted to that extraordinary act of bounty, out of a pique he had to Aristotle.[m] How generous, then, nay, how profuse, was Archelaus, that, out of his little and scanty

[f] Ἡμῖν τε καὶ τοῖς φίλοις. [g] Τοῖς . . ἑταίροις καὶ ἐπιτηδείοις.
[h] Βάτραχοι, p. 184. edit. Basil. [v. 1404. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]
[i] Ep. v. [j] Plut. Themist. [k] Terent. Heaut.
[l] Cicero, Tusc. v. Pecunia temporibus illis, Athenis præsertim, maxima.
[m] Laërt. in Arist.

revenue, could give as much as his great successor in the midst of the Persian treasures? But all this is spoiled again, when we consider, 'tis a sophist's present; who is liberal, indeed, of his paper notes, but never makes solid payment.

And now I suppose it will be thought no great matter, whether Sabirius Pollo, as Apollonides affirms, or any other unknown sophist, have the honour of the *Epistles*. I will take my leave of him and them, after I have done the same kindness to Apollonides that I did to Sabirius. For, as I read the name of the one *Σαβίδιος Πολλίων*, instead of *Σαβίριος Πόλλων*; so, for *Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεὺς*, I dare make bold to substitute *Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεύς*. The former was never heard of but here. This latter is mentioned by Laërtius, Harpocration, and others. He writ several books, and dedicated one of them to Tiberius.[n] The time, therefore, agrees exactly with this emendation; for, living in that emperor's days, he might well cite a Roman author, Sabidius Pollio. But, to take away all manner of scruple, this very book *About falsified History* is ascribed to Apollonides Nicenus by Ammonius;[o] *Ἀπολλωνίδης*, says he, *ὁ Νικαεὺς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ περὶ κατεψευσμένων*; just as the writer of Aratus's Life* says, *Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Κηφεὺς ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας*.

[n] Laërt. in Timone.

[o] V. *Κατοίκησις*. De Differ. Vocab.

[* Arat. ii. 433. *ed. Buhle.*—D.]

OF

ÆSOP'S FABLES.

I COULD easily go on, and discover to you many more impostures of this kind, the *Epistles* of Anacharsis, Heraclitus, Democritus, Hippocrates, Diogenes, Crates, and others. But perhaps I may be *exhorted** hereafter to put this *Dissertation* into Latin, with large additions: till which time I will adjourn the further discourse upon those several authors; and proceed now to the last thing proposed, *The Fables of Æsop*.

And here I am glad to find a good part of the work done ready to my hand. For Monsieur Bachet, S. de Meziriac, has writ *The Life of Æsop*, in French; which book, though I could never meet with it, I can guess from the great learning of the author, known to me by his other works, to have in a manner exhausted the subject. Vavasor too, *De Ludicrâ Dictione*, ascribes the present *Fables* to Maximus Planudes, and not to Æsop himself. See also a great deal upon this head in the late *Historical Dictionary* of Mr. Bayle. All which make me look upon Sir W. T.'s mighty commendation of the *Æsopean Fables* now extant, which is the occasion of this treatise, to be an unhappy paradox, neither worthy of the great author, nor agreeable to the rest of his excellent book. For, if I do not much deceive myself, I shall soon make it appear, that of all the compositions of the *Æsopic Fables*, these that we have now

[* See p. 177 and 181 of this vol.—D.]

left us are both the last and the worst. Though I do not intend a set discourse; but only a few loose things, that I fancy may have escaped the observation of others.

I. 'Tis very uncertain if Æsop himself left any fables behind him in writing:* the old man in Aristophanes[a] learned his fables in conversation, and not out of a book;

Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον ἢ Συβαριτικὸν
Ὧν ἔμαθες ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ ———

There's another passage in the same poet,[b] *Οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας*; which Suidas,[c] and from him Erasmus, Scaliger, &c. affirm to be used proverbially; *You have not read so much as Æsop* (spoken of idiots and illiterates). From whence one might conclude that Æsop wrote his own *Fables*, which were in every body's hands. But it plainly appears from the poet himself, that it is not a proverbial

[* "Æsopum ipsum fabulas solutâ oratione scriptas reliquisse cur dubite-" mus non video. Harum nonnullas etiam hodiè, quoad materiam, superesse ex " veterum testimoniis satis constat." TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio*, p. 25., where is the following note: "Dolendum est magnum Bentleium Dissertationem " suam de Æsopo eo modo quo illam de Phalaride non retractavisse. Multa " quæ hodiè obscura sunt in hâc materiâ sine dubio illustria fecisset singularis " ea, quâ in hisce litteris pollebat, eruditio et sagacitas. Sed ille, adversarios " Dissertatione secundâ Phalarideâ, velut fulmine, prostravisse contentus, à " pugnâ impari indignabundus recessit. Nonnulla igitur in Dissertatione " Æsopeâ reliquit vir maximus, quæ, si secundas curas adhibuisset, nisi fallor, " mutavisset. Tale est argumentum illud, quo probaturus est Æsopi fabulas, " tempore Socratis, scriptas non exstitisse, quia scilicet Socrates, qui aliquas " ex illis metricè expressit, 'non ait, *se usum fuisse libro fabularum;* sed, " *Scripsi*, inquit, *ὧν ἠπιστάμην, quas noveram, et primas in memoriam revocare* " *potui.*' Verba Socratis sunt ap. Platon. in Phædone: *οὓς προχείρους εἶχον* " *καὶ ἠπιστάμην μύθους τοῦ Αἰσώπου, τούτων ἐποίησα, οἷς πρώτοις ἐνέτυχον.* Sed " nemo certè concluserit, librum Æsopi fabulas continentem nusquam exsti-" tisse, ex eo quod Socrates, in carcere positus et libris omnibus, ut verisimile " est, destitutus, cùm fabulas unam et alteram (*ἀφοσιώσεως χάριν*, ut ipse ait) " metris claudere instituisset, ex memoriâ eas et non ex libro hauserit."— " The fact seems to be," says Bishop Blomfield, "that Æsop himself never " committed his fables to writing, but that a collection had been made of them " before the time of Socrates." *Mus. Crit.* I. 408.—D.]

[a] In Vespis, p. 357. [= v. 1259. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[b] In Avibus, p. 387. [= v. 471. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[c] Πατῆσαι.

saying: for, when one had said, *he never heard before that birds were older than the earth;* the other tells him, *he is unlearned, and unacquainted with Æsop;* who said, "that "the *lark* was the first of things; and she, when her father "died, (after he had laid five days unburied, because the "earth was not yet in being) at last buried him in her own "head." Now, what is there here like a proverb? But pray take notice, that this fable is not extant in our present collection; a good testimony that ours are not of the Phrygian's own composing.

I will mention another place of our poet; that I may, on this occasion, correct a gross error of the Scholiast. 'Tis extant *in Vespis*, p. 330.;*

Οἱ δὲ λέγουσι μύθους ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' Αἰσώπου τι γελοῖον.

Where he interprets *Αἰσώπου γελοῖον*, of one *Æsop, a ridiculous actor of tragedy.* But our Scholiast himself is more ridiculous; if it was he that writ this, and not some trifler, that foisted it in among the other's annotations. For there was no Æsop a Greek actor in the days of Aristophanes: he mistakes him for the famous Æsop in Cicero's time, an actor of tragedy on the Roman stage, and far from being ridiculous;

Quæ gravis Æsopus, quæ doctus Roscius egit.†

But, the Æsop meant by our poet is the Phrygian himself, whose Fables were called *jests*, *γελοῖα*: so in the other passage already cited, *Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον.* Hesychius, *Αἰσώπου γελοῖα· οὕτως ἔλεγον τοὺς Αἰσώπου μύθους.* Dion Chrysostom,[d] speaking of our Æsop, *Ἠνείχοντο αὐτὸν*, says he, *ἡδόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις.* Avienus, in his Preface; (*Æsopus*), *responso Delphici Apollinis monitus,* RIDICULA *orsus est.*

II. The first that we know of who essayed to put the

[* v. 566. *ed. Bekk.*—D.]

[† Hor. *Epist.* ii. 1. 82.—D.]

[d] Orat. lxxii. p. 631.

Æsopic Fables into verse was Socrates the philosopher.[e] Laërtius seems to hint that he did but one fable, and that with no great success: the beginning of it was this;

Αἴσωπός ποτ' ἔλεξε Κορίνθιον ἄστυ νέμουσι,
*Μὴ κρίνειν ἀρετὴν λαοδίκῳ σοφίῃ.**

'Tis observable, again, that Socrates does not say he made use of a *book* of fables; but, *I wrote*, says he, *ὧν ἠπιστάμην, those that I knew, and that I could first call to mind.*† And this fable too does not appear in our present collection, if we may gather so much from his naming the Corinthians.

III. After Socrates's time, Demetrius Phalereus made *Λόγων Αἰσωπείων Συναγωγὰς, Collections of Æsopean Fables;*[f] which, perhaps, were the first in their kind committed to writing; I mean, in form of a book. These seem to have been in prose; and some, perhaps, may imagine that they are the same that are now extant. I wish they were; for then they would have been well writ, with some genius and spirit. But I shall demonstrate ours to be of a modern date; and the composition itself speaks too loud that it is not Demetrius's.

IV. After him, there was somebody, whose name is now lost, that made a new edition of the *Fables* in elegiac verse; I find no mention of them but in Suidas, who cites them often, under the name of *Μῦθοι*, or *Μυθικά*. I will set down a few fragments of them; both to shew that they belong to the *Æsopic Fables*, which has not yet been observed, that I know of; and to enable you to judge, whether, if we could change our modern collection for these, we should not get by the bargain.

Τοὔνεκα τὴν ἰδίην οὔτις ὄπωπε δύην.[g]

This belongs to the fable about the two bags that every man

[e] Plato in Phædone. Plutarch. de Aud. Poët. Laërt. in Socrat.
[* Laërt. I. 106. *ed. Meib.*—D.]
[† See Tyrwhitt's remarks, in note, p. 223. of this vol.—D.]
[f] Laërt. in Demet. [g] Suidas in Δύη.

carries; one before, where he puts other men's faults; another behind him, where he puts his own. This is mentioned by Catullus, Horace, Phædrus, Galen, Themistius, Stobæus, &c.: and it is a blot upon our modern set, that there it is wanting.*

Αἰπειναῖς ἐλάταις ἔρισεν βάτος· ἡ μὲν ἔειπε
Καὶ ναῦς καὶ νηοὺς τεμνομένη[h] *τελέειν.*[i]

And,

Αἰπεινὴν ἐλάτην ἔρις ὤρορεν αἴσυλα φάσθαι.

And,

Οὐδὲ οἱ οὐδ' αἴθων ἄδε πάρδαλις, οὕνεκα θυμοῦ
Ἐμπλείη[j]————

And,

Πικρὴ μέν τε λύκοισιν, ἀτὰρ χιμάροισιν ἀκηδής.[k]

Some of them, it seems, were all hexameters;

————*Ὅθι στυφελῶν ἐπὶ πετρῶν*
Ὀστρακόεντά τε νῶτα καὶ ἀγκύλα γυῖα κεάσθη.[l]

'Tis an easy matter to find what fables these pieces relate to; and I think they are all extant in the present collection.

V. This, you see by this specimen, was no contemptible author: and after him came one Babrius, that gave a new turn of the *Fables* into choliambics.[m] Nobody, that I know of, mention[s] him, but Suidas, Avienus, and Jo. Tzetzes. There's one Gabrias,† indeed, yet extant, that has com-

[* "Libris Æsopi, qui tum ferebantur, objecit Bentleius, fabulam notis-"simam *de duabis peris* in iis non contineri; quam tamen habet Codex Bodl. "n. xlix." TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio* (*note*), p. 29.—D.]

[h] Vulgò *τεμνομένην.* [i] Id. in *Αἰπεινή.* [j] Id. in *Ἄδεν.*

[k] Id. *Ἀκηδής.* [. . . . . *λύκοις, αὐτὰρ. Suid. ed. Gaisf.*—D.]

[l] Id. *Στυφ.* [. . . . . *ἀπὸ πετρῶν. Suid. ed. Gaisf.*—D.] and Schol. Aristoph. p. 220. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 57.—D.]

[m] Suidas in *Βάβριος.*

[† Gabrias, or Ignatius, a monk of the ninth century. But let us hear Tyrwhitt: "Ignatium hunc Babrii fabulas in compendium redigisse suprà "monui, n. 5. quod luculenter confirmat titulus hic tetrastichis ejus in codice "Vindobonensi præscriptus; *Βαβρίου ἐν ἐπιτομῇ μεταγραφὲν ὑπὸ Ἰγνατίου Μα-"γίστορος. Fabric. Bibl. Gr.* I. 398. ed. 2dæ. Atque hinc nomen Gabriæ, qui

prised each fable in four sorry iambics. But our Babrius is a writer of another size and quality; and were his book now extant, it might justly be opposed, if not preferred, to the Latin of Phædrus. There's a whole fable of his yet preserved at the end of Gabrias, of the *Swallow and the Nightingale*. Suidas brings many citations out of him, all which shew him an excellent poet: as this of the *Sick Lion*;

—— *οἷά τις νούσῳ*
Κάμνων ἐβέβλητ', οὐκ ἀληθὲς ἀσθμαίνων.[n]

And that of the *Boar*,

Φρίξας δὲ χαίτην ἔκθορε φωλάδος κοίλης.[o]

And a great many others.

VI. I need not mention the Latin writers of the *Æsopean Fables*, Phædrus, Julius Titianus,[p] and Avienus; the two first in iambic, the last in elegiac: but I shall proceed to examine those Greek ones now extant, that assume the name of Æsop himself. There are two parcels of the present *Fables*; the one, which are the more ancient, CXXXVI. in number, were first published out of the Heidelberg Library, by Neveletus, A.D. MDCX. The editor himself well observed, that they were falsely ascribed to Æsop, because they mention holy monks.[q] To which I will add another remark, that there is a sentence out of Job, *Γυμνοὶ γὰρ ἤλθομεν οἱ πάντες, γυμνοὶ οὖν ἀπελευσόμεθα, naked we all came, and naked shall we return.*[r] But, because these

" nullus, ut credo, exstitit, opusculo huic adhæsisse suspicor, cùm in quibus-
" dam exemplaribus, errore scribæ, Γαβρίου pro Βαβρίου lectum sit. Qui error
" etiam apud Tzetzem deprehenditur, Chil. viii. 516." *Diss. de Babrio* (*note*), p. 32.—D.]

[n] Suidas in Ἀσθμ. [and Σπήλυγξ.—D.]

[o] Suidas in Ἔκθορε. [This line is to be referred to the fable of the Lion, the Mouse, and the Fox: see Suidas in Φριξότριχα, and Tyrwhitt, *Diss. de Babrio*, p. 38.—D.]

[p] Ausonius, Ep. xvi.

[q] Φιλερήμοις κατὰ θεὸν μοναχοῖς. Fab. 152.

[r] See Fab. 288. Job, i. 21.

two passages are in the *epimythion*, and belong not to the fable itself, they may justly be supposed to be additions only, and interpolations of the true book. I shall therefore give some better reasons to prove they are a recent work. That they cannot be Æsop's own, the CLXXXI. fable is a demonstrative proof. For that is a story of Demades the rhetor, who lived above CC. years after our Phrygian's time. The CXCIII. is about Momus's carping at the works of the gods. There he finds this fault in the bull, *that his eyes were not placed in his horns, so as he might see where he pushed.* But Lucian[s] (speaking of the same fable) has it thus, *that his horns were not placed right before his eyes.* And Aristotle[t] has it a third way, *that his horns were not placed about his shoulders, where he might make the strongest push, but in the tenderest part, his head.* Again, Momus blames this in the man, *that his φρένες did not hang on the outside of him, so as his thoughts might be seen:* but in Lucian[u] the fault is, *that he had not a window in his breast.* I think it probable from hence, that Æsop did not write a book of his *Fables;* for then there would not have been such a difference in the telling. Or, at least, if these that are now extant were Æsop's, I should guess, from this specimen, that Lucian had the better on't, and beat him at his own play.*

VII. But that they are recenter than even Babrius, who is himself one of the latest age of good writers,† I discovered

[s] In Nigrino. [t] De Part. Anim. l. iii. p. 54.

[u] In Hermotimo.

[* " Similiter objecit [see note, p. 226. of this vol.] vir doctissimus fabulam " CXCIII. (edit. Oxon. 190.) aliter legi quàm aut ab Aristotele, *de Part. Anim.* " l. iii. c. 2. aut à Luciano, *in Nigrino*, p. 74. et *Hermot.* p. 759. memoratur, quos " etiam ipsos inter se non convenire notat. Hæc autem fabula in Cod. Bodl. " non paulò meliùs quàm in editis exhibetur, et ad mentem Luciani multò pro- " piùs; ita ut suspicioni locus sit, Aristotelem ad ipsius Æsopi fabulam allusisse, " Lucianum autem ad eandem ut à Babrio repetita est." TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio* (*note*), p. 29.—D.]

[† " Quis ille Babrius, quibus temporibus et locis vixerit, nondum compertum est. Suidas, qui ex opere ejus multa protulit, de ipso hæc pauca notat.

by this means. I observed in 'em several passages that were not of a piece with the rest, but had a turn and composition plainly poetical: as in the CCLXIII. fable, which begins thus; *Ὄνος πατήσας σκόλοπα χωλὸς ἑστήκει.* This I saw was a choliambic verse, and I presently suspected that the writer had taken it out of Babrius. And I was soon confirmed in my judgment by this fragment of his, that belongs to the same fable;

Ὁ δ' ἐκλυθεὶς πόνων τε κἀνίας πάσης,
Τὸν κνηκίαν χάσκοντα λακτίσας φεύγει.[v]

For in the fable in prose there are these words; *Ὁ ὄνος δὲ ΛΥΘΕΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΝΟΥ, ἐπὶ τὸν λύκον ΧΑΣΚΟΝΤΑ ΛΑΚΤΙΣΑΣ ΦΕΥΓΕΙ.* Whence it evidently appears, that the author of that parcel which was published by Neveletus did nothing else but epitomise Babrius, and put him into

" Βαβρίας, ἢ Βάβριος. *μύθους ἤτοι μυθιάμβους, εἰσι γὰρ διὰ χοριάμβων* [l. χωλιάμ-
" *βων*] *ἐν βιβλίοις δέκα. οὗτος ἐκ τῶν Αἰσωπείων μύθων μετέβαλεν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῶν*
" *λογοποιΐας εἰς ἔμμετρα, ἤγουν τοὺς χοριάμβους* [l. χωλιάμβους]. Bentleius
" [*Dissert. upon Æsop*, sect. vii.] ponit eum *in ultimâ ætate bonorum auctorum.*
" Quod vagum est, et nullo, quantùm video, argumento fundatum. Si crisis
" illa, quam nuper proposui [*Archæologia*, vol. iii. p. 235.], de loco Apollonii
" in Lexico Homerico, v. Ἄειδε, vera sit (ut verissimam credo), juvabit non-
" nihil ad ætatem Babrii accuratiùs paulò determinandam. Locus iste ex con-
" jecturâ nostrâ in metra choliambica distribuendus est, et sic legendus,

——— *ταῦτα δ' Αἴσωπος*
ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν, ὄντιν' οἱ Δελφοὶ [vulgò ἀδελφοὶ]
ᾄδοντα μῦθον οὐ καλῶς ἐδέξαντο.

" Hæc Babrii esse et metrum et sensus clamant. Hunc igitur Apollonio anti-
" quiorem tutò statuamus; Apollonium autem circa tempora Augusti floruisse,
" cum cl. ejus editore, verisimillimum arbitror; aut etiam aliquantò priùs.
" Ætati autem Babrio sic assignatæ suffragatur Avienus, qui eum ante Phæ-
" drum collocat. *Præf. Fab. Avieni.* 'Quas (fabulas scilicet Æsopi) Græcis
" iambis Babrius repetens in duo volumina coartavit; Phædrus etiam partem
" aliquam quinque in libellos resolvit.' In hoc autem ab Avieno Suidas disce-
" dere videatur, cùm alter Babrio *duo volumina*, alter *decem libros* tribuat; sed
" non constat Avienum *volumina* posuisse eodem sensu, quo Suidas *βιβλία*; et
" præterea numeri in Codd. MSS. non rarò turbantur." TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio* (*note*), p. l.—D.]

[v] Suidas in Κνηκίας.

prose.* But I will give you some further proofs of it. The CCLXI. begins thus; *Ὄνῳ τις ἐπιθεὶς ξόανον ἤγε.* Which, at the first reading, one perceives to be part of a scazon; and thus it is in a fragment of Babrius;

Ὄνῳ τις ἐπιθεὶς ξόανον εἶχε κωμήτης.[w]

In the CLVI. [CLXVI.], about the *Fox* with the *Firebrand; Ταύτην δὲ δαίμων εἰς τὰς ἀρούρας τοῦ βαλόντος ὡδήγει.* Who does not discover here a scazon of Babrius?

Εἰς τὰς ἀρούρας τοῦ βαλόντος ὡδήγει.

The CCXLIII. is a manifest turning out of choliambics into prose, for the whole is made up either of pieces or entire verses;

—— *ἡλίου πλέον λάμπει.*

And,

Ἀνέμου δὲ συῤῥεύσαντος, εὐθὺς ἐσβέσθη.

And,

Ἐκ δευτέρου δ' ἅπτων τις—

And,

—— *φαῖνε, λύχνε, καὶ σίγα,*
Τῶν ἀστέρων τὸ φέγγος οὔποτ' ἐκλείπει.

In the CCXCIII. there are these remnants of Babrius;

Πόσῃ γὰρ ὁλκῇ τ' οὖμον αἷμα προσθήσῃ.

[* "Mihi sanè .... verisimile videtur collectiones omnes, quas hodiè te-
" nemus, fabularum Æsopearum ab opere Babriano originem suam duxisse,
" differentias autem earum scriptorum multitudini imputandas esse, qui diversis
" temporibus, et locis, et ingeniis, et studiis, metrorum elegantissimorum
" partes varias, pro libitu suo quisque, in prosam traducendas sumpserunt."
TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio*, p. 25.—"Rectè quidem *collectiones* scribit Tyr-
" whittus, sed rem deinceps ita definit, quasi *omnes*, quæ his collectionibus
" continentur, *fabulæ* è Babriano opere fluxerint, quod falsum esse, vel ea
" exempla docent, quæ infrà à nobis proferentur. Nunquam defuerunt Græ-
" culi, qui priscis et genuinis fabulis novas h. e. suas adderent."—HUSCHKE,
Diss. de Fab. Archil.—apud Fab. Æsop. ed. Fur. (1810.) I. ccxi.—D.]

[w] Suidas in Κωμῆται.

And,

Ἔσται μάγειρος, ὅς με συντόμως θύσει.

And,

——*καὶ πάλιν κερεῖ με, καὶ σώσει.*

The CLXV. begins thus; *Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύο ἐρωμένας εἶχεν· ὧν ἡ μὲν μία νεᾶνις, ἡ δὲ ἄλλη πρεσβύτις*: which I suppose to have been in Babrius thus;

Ἀνὴρ μεσοπολιὸς δύ' ἐρωμένας εἶχεν,
Ὧν ἡ μία νεᾶνις, ἡ δὲ πρεσβύτις.

Or,

Ὧν ἡ μὲν ἦν ν:

In all these passages here are most visible footsteps by which we may trace our imitator; but generally he has so disguised the fables, that nobody can find they ever belonged to Babrius. In the CCXLV., about the priests of Cybele, there's nothing but a short dry story, and no reliques of a verse. But there's a noble fragment of Babrius, belonging to the same fable, which I will here set down; both to correct it (for he that has given it us has printed it false[x]), and to shew you how much we have lost;

Γάλλοις ἀγύρταις εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἐπράθη
Ὄνος τις οὐκ εὔμοιρος, ἀλλὰ δυσδαίμων,
Ὅστις φέρῃ πτωχοῖσι καὶ πανούργοισι
Πείνης ἄκος δίψης τε, καὶ κακὴν τέχνην.
Οὗτοι δὲ κύκλῳ πᾶσαν ἐξ ἔθους κώμην
Περιϊόντες ἐλέγοντο· τίς γὰρ ἀγροίκων*
Οὐκ οἶδεν Ἄττιν λευκὸν, ὡς ἐπηρώθη;
Τίς οὐκ ἀπαρχὰς ὀσπρίων τε καὶ σίτων
Ἁγνῷ φέρων δίδωσι τυμπάνῳ Ῥείης;

VIII. Thus I have proved one half of the *Fables* now

[x] Natal. Com. l. ix. c. 5. [p. 968. *ed.* 1619., where in v. 4. *πείνης σάκος* and *κακῆς τέχνης*, and in v. 6. *ἔλεγον*.—D.]

[* See Dobree's note, Porsoni *Aristophanica*, p. 135. (*Adden.*)—D.]

extant that carry the name of Æsop to be above a thousand years more recent than he. And the other half, that were public before Neveletus, will be found to be yet more modern, and the latest of all. That they are not from Æsop's own hand, we may know from the LXX., *Of the Serpent and the Crab-fish;* which is taken from a *scolion*, or catch, much older than Æsop, that is extant in Athenæus,[y] and must be corrected thus;

Ὁ καρκίνος ὧδε ἔφα, χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβών·
Εὐθὺν χρὴ ἑταῖρον ἔμεν, καὶ μὴ σκολιὰ φρονεῖν.

And there is great reason to believe that they were drawn up by Planudes, one of the later Greeks, that translated into his native tongue Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Cato's *Distichs*, Cæsar's *Commentaries*, and Macrobius. For there is no manuscript any where above CCC. years old, that has the *Fables* according to that copy. Besides that, there are several passages that betray a modern writer: as in the LXXVII., *βούταλις*, a *bird;* and XXXIX., *βούνευρον*, a *beast;* both unknown to all ancient authors: and in the CXXIX. *βοῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, crying in his heart*, a manifest Hebraism, in imitation of *Eccles.* xi. 1., *εἶπον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.* The LXXV., about the Æthiopian, is taken almost word for word out of the VI. of Aphthonius the rhetorician, who made an *essay* upon some *Æsopic Fables*, that is yet extant. The IV., as appears from the last sentence of it, is a paraphrase on the CCLXXXIV. of Neveletus's parcel; which parcel, as I have proved above, are a traduction of Babrius; and particularly in this very fable there are footsteps of his verses;

—— *κατῆλθεν εἰς βαθὺν κρημνόν.*

[y] Lib. xv. c. 15. [=c. 50. V. 540. *ed. Schw.*, where

Ὁ καρκίνος ὧδ' ἔφη,
χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβών·
Εὐθέα χρὴ τὸν ἑταῖρον ἔμεν,
καὶ μὴ σκολιὰ φρονεῖν.

See also Schw. in *Animadv. in Athen.* VIII. 265. sqq.—D.]

And,

—— μετενόει, καὶ βοηθὸν ἐζήτει.

This collection, therefore, is more recent than that other; and coming first abroad with Æsop's *Life*, writ by Planudes, 'tis justly believed to be owing to the same writer.*

IX. That idiot of a monk has given us a book, which he calls *The Life of Æsop*, that, perhaps, cannot be matched in any language for ignorance and nonsense. He had picked up two or three true stories; that Æsop was slave to one Xanthus, carried a burden of bread,[z] conversed with Crœsus, and was put to death at Delphi: but the circumstances of these, and all his other tales, are pure invention. He makes Xanthus, an ordinary Lydian or Samian, to be a *philosopher*;[a] which word was not heard of in those days, but in-

[* "Primus, quòd sciam, Neveletus fabulas has Æsopi *à Maximo Planude, ut et vitam ejus, scriptas* se existimare prodidit. *Præf. ad Fab.* Eandem opinionem videtur amplecti Bentleius, *Dissert. upon Æsop*, sect. viii. Et profectò si Vitæ Æsopi, à Planude certissimè scriptæ, eædem fabulæ semper subjunctæ invenirentur, opinio ista verisimilitudine non careret. Sed res, opinor, longè aliter se habet. Vita Æsopi, cum nomine Planudis, sæpissimè MS. occurrit sine ullis fabulis. Occurrit etiam præfixa collectionibus fabularum, quæ ab illâ, quam Accursius exscripsit, multùm discrepant. Ita fuisse credo in MS. Stephaniano. Ita certè est in MS. Laudiano *Bibl. Bodl.* n. 699. ubi Vitam Æsopi à Planude scriptam sequuntur fabulæ, plures quidem ex Accursianis (quanquam diverso ordine), sed etiam multæ ex Neveletianis. Quare nullam idoneam rationem video, quâ adducamur ad credendum fabulas eas, quas Accursius vulgavit, à Maximo Planude scriptas fuisse. Alia est doctissimi Bentleii in eâdem Dissertatione hypothesis, quam sine ampliore probatione admittere nolim, nempe collectionem hanc Accursianam Neveletianâ recentiorem esse. Neutram ab Æsopo ipso conditam libens concesserim; sed quæ ex illis recentior, quæ vetustior, frustrà quæri existimo, cùm in utrâque complures fabulæ diversis auctoribus et temporibus, ut verisimile est, consarcinatæ legantur." TYRWHITT, *Diss. de Babrio* (*note*), p. 21. See also HUSCHKE, *Diss. de Fab. Archil.—apud Fab. Æsop. ed. Fur.* (1810.) I. ccxlvi.—"It is . . . clear that Planudes did nothing more than make some alterations in the style and number of this collection of fables, which, together with the life, was extant long before his time." BLOMFIELD, *Mus. Crit.* I. 409.—On the error of attributing the *Life of Æsop* to Planudes, see *Prolegomena ad Fab. Æsop.* p. x. *ed. Fur.* 1810.—D.]

[z] Eustath. in X. Odyss. p. 785. [*ed. Basil.*—D.]

[a] Ξάνθος ὁ φιλόσοφος.

vented afterwards by Pythagoras. He makes him attended too, like Plato and Aristotle, by a company of scholars, whom he calls σχολαστικοί; though the word was not yet used in that sense even in Aristotle's time. 'Twas the king of Æthiopia's problem to Amasis king of Ægypt, *To drink up the sea*;[b] but Planudes makes it a wager of Xanthus with one of his scholars. To say nothing of his chronological errors, mistakes of a hundred or two hundred years; who can read, with any patience, that silly discourse between Xanthus and his man Æsop; not a bit better than our *penny merriments*, printed at London Bridge?

X. But of all his injuries to Æsop, that which can least be forgiven him, is, the making such a monster of him for ugliness; an abuse that has found credit so universally, that all the modern painters, since the time of Planudes, have drawn him in the worst shapes and features that fancy could invent. 'Twas an old tradition among the Greeks, that Æsop revived again, and lived a second life.[c] Should he revive once more, and see the picture before the book that carries his name, could he think it drawn for himself? or for the monkey, or some strange beast introduced in the *Fables?* But what revelation had this monk about Æsop's deformity? For he must learn it by dream and vision, and not by ordinary methods of knowledge. He lived about two thousand years after him;[d] and in all that tract of time there's not one single author that has given the least hint that Æsop was ugly. What credit then can be given to an ignorant monk, that broaches a new story, after so many ages?* In Plutarch's *Convivium* our Æsop is one of the

[b] Plutarch. in Conviv.

[c] Suidas in Αἴς. and Ἀναβιῶναι. Schol. Aristoph. p. 357 and 387. [*Schol. to ed. Bekk.* p. 177 and 241.—D.]

[d] A.D. MCCCLXX.

[* "Planudem in hâc re tradenda modum excessisse, non negaverim. Sed "paulò confidentiùs scribit criticorum princeps [Bentleius]. . . . . Atqui "in manibus est auctor, pro tali annorum ratione, satis antiquus, sæculi certè "quarti scriptor, qui hanc rem vel fando vel legendo cognoverat, Himerium "dico, Orat. xiii. 5. p. 592. ed. Wernsd. ita scribentem: φασὶ δὲ καὶ Αἴσωπον

guests, with Solon and the other sages of Greece; there is abundance of jest and raillery there among them, and particularly upon Æsop; but nobody drolls upon his ugly face, which could hardly have escaped, had he had such a bad one. Perhaps you'll say it had been rude and indecent to touch upon a natural imperfection. Not at all, if it had been done softly and jocosely. In Plato's *Feast* they are very merry upon Socrates's face, that resembled old Silenus: and in this they twit Æsop for having been a slave, which was no more his fault than deformity would have been. Philostratus has given us, in two books, a description of a gallery of pictures; one of which is Æsop, with a chorus of animals about him.[e] There he is represented *smiling and looking towards the ground, in a posture of thought;* but not a word of his deformity, which, were it true, must needs have been touched on, in an account of a picture. The Athenians set up a noble statue to his honour and memory;

> *Æsopo ingentem statuam posuere Attici,*
> *Servumque collocárunt æternâ in basi;*
> *Patere honoris scirent ut cuncti viam,*
> *Nec generi tribui, sed virtuti, gloriam.*[f]

But, had he been such a monster as Planudes has made of him, a statue had been no better than a monument of his

" τὸν λογοποιὸν τὸν Φρύγα, οὗ μὴ ὅτι τοὺς λόγους τινὰς, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ " πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν φωνὴν γέλωτα καὶ χλεύην ἤγηντο, γενέσθαι μὲν πάνσοφον καὶ " διὰ τοῦτο ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος." HUSCHKE, *Diss. de Fab. Archil.—apud Fab. Æsop. ed. Fur.* (1810.) I. ccx.—D.]

[e] P. 73. [=766. *ed. Olear.*—D.]

[f] Phædrus, l. ii. ult. [Dr. B. in his edition of *Phædrus*, offers from others an emendation of the first verse; and would read *Æsopi ingenio:* but though *ingens* is very awkward, *ingenio* seems no better: unless we say it must be *ingens statua* indeed, whose *basis* is *æterna.* SALTER. *Note on ed.* 1777.—Bentley, in his ed. of Phædrus, reads in the first verse "*Æsopi ingenio*" (an emendation of Gudius), and in the third "*honori.*" See, on this passage, Hare's *Epistola Critica*, p. 72.—D.]

ugliness: it had been kinder to his memory to have let that alone. But the famous Lysippus was the statuary that made it. And must so great a hand be employed to dress up a lump of deformity? Agathias the poet has left us an epigram upon that statue;[g]

Εὖγε ποιῶν, Λύσιππε γέρων, Σικυώνιε πλάστα,
Δείκελον Αἰσώπου στήσαο τοῦ Σαμίου, &c.

How could he too have omitted to speak of it, had his ugliness been so notorious? The Greeks have several proverbs about persons deformed; *Θερσίτειον βλέμμα, Εἰδεχθὴς Κορυδεὺς,* &c. Our Æsop, if so very ugly, had been in the first rank of them; especially when his statue had stood there, to put every body in mind of it. He was a great favourite of Crœsus king of Lydia, who employed him as his ambassador to Corinth and Delphi. But would such a monster as Planudes has set out be a fit companion for a prince? or a proper ambassador, to be hooted at by all the boys wherever he came? Plutarch represents him as a polite and elegant courtier, rebuking Solon for his gruff and clownish behaviour with Crœsus; telling him he must converse with princes *ἢ ὡς ἥδιστα, ἢ ὡς ἥκιστα, either agreeably, or not at all.*[h] Now, could either such a station, or such a discourse, befit Æsop, if he was truly that scarecrow as he is now commonly painted? But I wish I could do that justice to the memory of our Phrygian, to oblige the painters to change their pencil. For 'tis certain he was no deformed person; and 'tis probable he was very handsome. For, whether he was a Phrygian, or, as others say, a Thracian, he must have been sold into Samos by a trader in *slaves*. And 'tis well known that that sort of people commonly bought up the most beautiful they could light on, because they would yield the most profit. And there is

[g] Anthol. lib. iv. Εἰς Φιλοσ. [*Anth. Gr. ex. rec. Br.* (*ed. Jacobs.*) IV. 16.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* II. 725.—D.]

[h] Plut. in Solone.

mention of two slaves, fellow-servants together, Æsop, and Rhodopis a woman; and, if we may guess him by his companion and *contubernalis*,[i] we must needs believe him a comely person. For that Rhodopis was the greatest beauty of all her age; and even a proverb arose in memory of it;[j]

Ἅπανθ' ὅμοια, καὶ Ῥοδῶπις ἡ καλή.

[i] Pliny, xxxvi. 12.

[j] Herodotus, Suidas, Strabo. [See too Erasmi *Adagia*, p. 1648. *ed.* 1606. —D.]

RICHARDI BENTLEII

EPISTOLA

AD CL. V.

JOANNEM MILLIUM, S.T.P.

(Ad calcem librorum, quorum alter inscribitur *Joannis Antiocheni cognomento Malalæ Historia Chronica*, ed. Oxon. 1691., alter *Emendationes in Menandri et Philemonis Reliquias*, ed. Cant. 1713.)

CL. VIRO

JOANNI MILLIO, S. T. P.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS

S.

Memini equidem, Milli doctissime, cum abhinc dies compluscules deambularemus una, strenueque de literulis nostris sermones cæderemus; ibi forte fortuna de Joanne Antiochensi mentionem fuisse injectam: cumque me desiderium cepisset librum adhuc musteum videndi, priusquam in lucem publicam, te curante, exiret; ea me lege id abs te impetravisse, ut siqua in tam depravato scriptore emendationem nostram accipere possent, ea in schedulas conjecta ad te mitterem. Duram profecto conditionem, quamque adeo multis de causis nollem acceptam. Nam ut omittam, quod ex illo fere tempore a meliori librorum et chartularum mearum parte, et (quod acerbius mihi accidit) a jucundissima tua consuetudine longe disjunctus sim; quodque semel duntaxat hunc Malelam properans percurrerim, nec ut secundas, quas sapientiores esse aiunt, curas et cogitationes adhiberem, ullo adhuc pacto potuerim animum inducere: ut illa, inquam, atque alia præteream; pudet hercle, ut verum fatear, pigetque bonas horas, quæ haud paulo melius collocari possent, in tam ingrato et ignobili labore consumere. Sed quid faciam? data est fides: promissa flagitantur. Video, quod mihi egomet intrivi, exedendum esse. Liceat modo, siquando in hac ἀναγκοφαγίᾳ fastidium mihi suborietur, ali-

unde petere quod fluentem nauseam coerceat. Dabitur itaque potestas et venia evagandi identidem longiuscule; dummodo ne plane ἔξω τῶν ἐλαιῶν, neque levibus de causis. Hoc autem scias velim in primis; non mihi consilium esse de Joanne isto qui cujasve fuerit, quando vixerit, aut a quibus laudatus sit, omnino verbum facere: cum diu sit quod omnem istam controversiam suscepit amicissimus noster atque eruditissimus Hodius.[a] Quippe aliud est, inquam, scriptionis hujus institutum: quæ vereor equidem ut satis ex voto et feliciter mihi vertat. Ita sane præsagit animus, ita in ipso limine conspicio, quod etiam fortissimo terrorem incutiat. Siquidem recte narrat Malelas pag. 90. edixisse nimirum atque interminatum esse Orphea, ne quisquam mortalium palam fecerit τὰ Ἐρικεπεώ. οὗ, ait, ὄνομα ὁ αὐτὸς Ὀρφεὺς ἀκούσας ἐκ τῆς μαντείας ἐξεῖπε, Μή τινα φάναι τὰ Ἐρικεπεὼ, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται τῇ κοινῇ γλώσσῃ, βουλὴ, φῶς, ζωοδοτήρ. Ego vero cum haud sim nescius, quam acerbos olim vindices deos hominesque habuerit, qui μυστήρια ἐξορχήσασθαι et Eleusinæ Matris occulta proferre ausus sit; quî sciam, annon ipse similem in me noxam admittam, si mysterium hoc Orphicum sacro hactenus silentio celatum evulgavero? Neque adeo clam me est, O Milli suavissime, quam audax impulsu tuo in me meosque facinus consciscam:

> Sed tua me virtus tamen, et sperata voluptas
> Suavis amicitiæ, quodvis discrimen adire
> Suadet, et inducit dias in luminis oras[b]

horribile illud arcanum protrahere. Bono verò animo eris, capitique et ætati meæ parces metuere; ubi μορμολυκείῳ

[[a] Vide *Humfredi Hodii de Autore Prolegomena* in Malel. ed. Oxon. Confer etiam Jortinum, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* v. iv. p. 383.; Gibbonum, *Hist. of the Decline*, &c. chap. xl. note 11.; Reiskum, *Comment. ad Constant. Porph. de Cerim.* &c. p. 855. ed. 1830.; Lud. Dindorfium, *Præf. ad Mal. Chron.* ed. 1831.—D.]

[[b] Lucretius:

> Sed tua me virtus tamen, et sperata voluptas
> Suavis amicitiæ, *quemvis ecferre laborem*
> Suadet, et inducit *nocteis vigilare serenas.* I. 141.
> ——— dias in luminis oras. I. 23.—D.]

isto detracto, putidisque illis *μή τινα φάναι τὰ Ἐρικεπεὼ* in malam rem ablegatis aliquo, veterem illuc et veram lectionem quasi postliminio reduxero. Ea hæc est: *Οὗ (θεοῦ) ὄνομα ὁ αὐτὸς Ὀρφεὺς ἀκούσας ἐκ τῆς μαντείας ἐξεῖπε Μῆτιν, Φάνητα, Ἠρικεπαῖον.* Orpheus, ait, per oraculum edoctus est Dei nomina *Μῆτιν* esse et *Φάνητα*, et *Ἠρικεπαῖον*, quæ communi sermone interpretata hanc habent vim et sententiam, *Βουλή, Φῶς, Ζωοδοτήρ.*

Porro hisce nominibus Deum Orphicum vocari non desunt mihi locupletes certissimique sane auctores. Damascius *περὶ τῶν πρώτων ἀρχῶν* MS. in Bibliotheca Coll. Corporis Christi Oxonii p. 156.[c] *Ἐν μὲν τοίνυν ταῖς φερομέναις ταύταις ῥαψῳδίαις Ὀρφικαῖς ἡ*[d] *θεολογία δή τις ἐστὶν ἡ περὶ τὸν*[e] *νοητὸν (διάκοσμον) ἣν καὶ οἱ φιλόσοφοι διερμηνεύουσιν, ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς μιᾶς τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς τὸν χρόνον τιθέντες, ἀντὶ δὲ ταῖν*[f] *δυοῖν Αἰθέρα καὶ Χάος, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ὄντος ἁπλῶς τὸ Ὢὸν ἀπολογιζόμενοι, καὶ τριάδα ταύτην πρώτην ποιοῦντες. εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν τελεῖν ἤτοι τὸ κυούμενον καὶ τὸ κύον Ὢὸν τὸν θεὸν, ἢ τὸν ἀργῆτα χιτῶνα ἢ τὴν Νεφέλην, ὅτι ἐκ τούτων ἐκθρώσκει ὁ ΦΑΝΗΣ. ἄλλοτε γὰρ ἄλλα περὶ τοῦ μέσου φιλοσοφοῦσι, τοῦτο μὲν*[g] *ὁποῖον ἂν ᾖ ὡς τὸν νοῦν, ὡς δὲ πατέρα καὶ δύναμιν ἄλλα τινὰ προσεπινοοῦντες οὐδὲν τῷ Ὀρφεῖ προσήκοντα· τὴν δὲ τρίτην τὸν ΜΗΤΙΝ τὸν ΗΡΙΚΕΠΑΙΟΝ ὡς δύναμιν, τὸν ΦΑΝΗΤΑ αὐτὸν ὡς πατέρα.*[h] Idem ibidem p. 106.[i] *ὅθεν πηγὴν μὲν πηγῶν αὐτὸ*[j] *(τὸ Ἓν) Χαλδαίων παῖδες ἀνευφημοῦσιν, Ὀρφεὺς δὲ μικτιῆ*[k] *σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν, Φοίνικες δὲ αἰῶνα κοσμικὸν, ὡς πάντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ συνῃρηκότα.* Locus corruptus. Lego: *Ὀρφεὺς δὲ ΜΗΤΙΝ σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν . . .*

[c p. 380. ed. Kopp.—Tria typographi errata, quæ, in hoc Damascii loco, exhibet ed. Lips. *Epist. ad Mill.* 1781, pro Bentleii emendationibus habuit Koppius!—D.]

[d *εἰ.* ed. Kopp.—D.]

[e *τὸ.* ed. Kopp.—D.]

[f *τοῖν.* ed Kopp.—D.]

[g *μὲν οὖν.* ed. Kopp.—D.]

[h "Quorum postrema sic emendanda sunt, *Εἰς δὲ τὴν τρίτην (τριάδα τελεῖν) τὸν Μῆτιν ὡς νοῦν, τὸν Ἠρικεπαῖον ὡς δύναμιν*, &c." Lobeckius, *Aglaoph.* t. i. p. 483.—D.]

[i p. 268. ed. Kopp.—D.]

[j *αὐτὸ πηγῶν.* ed. Kopp.—D.]

[k *μικτὶ ἢ.* ed. Kopp.—D.]

Et pag. 125.[l] *Οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὠοῦ παράγει. καὶ τῆς Νεφέλης ῥαγείσης* (hac modo occasione cogita, an in loco superiore pro *ἀργῆτα* reponi placeat *τὸν ῥαγέντα χιτῶνα ἢ νεφέλην*) *τὸν πολυτίμητον φάνηται, πρόοδον. καὶ ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῷ νῷ*[m] *ὑποστησάμενος. ἢ ῥητέον πρὸς ταῦτα,* et quæ sequuntur. Lege et distingue: *τὸν πολυτίμητον ΦΑΝΗΤΑ, πρόοδον καὶ ἐκεῖνος,* &c. Et præterea p. 124.[n]

Ἔνθεν ἀποθρώσκει γένεσις πολυπιδάκου[o] *ὕλης,*

καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα περὶ τῆς τάξεως ἐκείνης οἱ θεοὶ χρησμῳδοῦσιν· ἀλλὰ καὶ Ὀρφεὺς τὸν πολυτίμητον τοῦτον θεὸν ἀνευφήσαιμι[p] *τὸν σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν κ' αὐτὸν ἠρικεπαῖον, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ προϊοῦσαν ἅπασαν τὴν τῶν θεῶν γενεάν.* Enimvero non leviter mendis aspersa est hæc *ῥῆσις,* quam ita constitues: *καὶ Ὀρφεὺς τὸν πολυτίμητον τοῦτον θεὸν ἀνευφημεῖ*

ΜΗΤΙΝ σπέρμα φέροντα θεῶν κλυτὸν ΗΡΙΚΕΠΑΙΟΝ.

Pagina denique 164.[q] *Τοῖον ἀπέστιλβε χρόνος ἀθανάτοιο ΦΑΝΗΤΟΣ,* ubi legendum *χροὸς,* ut quidem extat apud Proclum:[r]

Θαύμαζον καθορῶντες ἐν αἰθέρι φέγγος ἄελπτον,
Τοῖον ἀπέστιλβε χροὸς ἀθανάτοιο Φάνητος.

Idem Proclus in *Parmenidem* MS. hæc habet:[s] *ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ὀρφεὺς μετὰ τὴν κατάποσιν τοῦ ΦΑΝΗΤΟΣ ἐν τῷ Διὶ τὰ πάντα γεγονέναι φησίν. ἐπειδὴ πρότερον*[t] *μὲν καὶ ἡνωμένως ἐν ἐκείνῳ, δευτέρως δὲ καὶ διακεκριμένως ἐν τῷ δημιουργῷ*

[l p. 309. ed. Kopp.—D.]
[m νοητῷ. ed. Kopp.—D.]
[n p. 307. ed. Kopp.—D.]
[o πολυποικίλου. ed. Kopp. In *Orph.* p. 467. ed. Herman. sic (e Proclo) legitur versus:

ἔνθεν ἄδην θρώσκει γένεσις πολυποικίλου ὕλης. D.]

[p ἀνευφήμησεν. ed. Kopp.—D.]
[q Deest hic locus, nisi fallor, in ed. Kopp.—D.]
[r In *Timæum*, p. 132. ed. Basil. ubi Τὸ ὂν ἀπέστιλβε. Eosdem versus paulo aliter citat Hermias in *Phædr.*: vide *Orph.* p. 506. ed. Herman.—D.]
[s Procli *Opp.* t. v. p. 22. ed. Cous.—D.]
[t πρώτως. ed. Cous.—D.]

τὰ πάντα ἀνεφάνη τὰ τῶν ἐγκοσμημάτων[u] *αἴτια.* et in *Alcibiadem priorem* MS. sic scribit:[v] *Καί μοι δοκεῖ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων εὑρὼν παρ' Ὀρφεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον*[w] *καὶ Ἔρωτα καὶ Δαίμονα μέγαν ἀποκαλούμενον, ἀγαπῆσαι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἔρωτος τὸν τοιοῦτον ὕμνον· περὶ μὲν γὰρ νοητοῦ*[x] *νοῦ λέγων ὁ Θεολόγος,*

Ἄβρὸς Ἔρως[y] *καὶ ΜΗΤΙΣ ἀτάσθαλος —*

καὶ πάλιν·

Οἷσιν ἐπεμβεβαὼς Δαίμων μέγας αἰὲν ἐπ' ἴχνη·

περὶ δὲ τοῦ νοεροῦ νοῦ καὶ ἀμεθέκτου,[z]

Καὶ ΜΗΤΙΣ πρῶτος γενέτωρ καὶ Ἔρως πολυτερπής·

καὶ πάλιν·

Ἓν κράτος, εἷς Δαίμων γένετο μέγας, ἀρχὸς ἁπάντων.

Multa prudens et sciens prætereo, quæ ex Athenagora, Macrobio, *Orphicis Hymnis,* tum autem præcipue e Proclo in Platonis *Timæum* adferre possem: ne forte qui me minus norunt, Pauli Leopardi[a] scrinia me compilare[b] existiment. Inde petere possunt, vel a Theodoro Cantero,[c] qui plura de his rebus scire desiderent. Nam quid ego censeam de illorum sententia, qui significationem mendosi verbi *Ἐρικεπεὼ* ex anilibus Cabbalistarum nugis conantur exsculpere? sed nolo aliquid inclementer dicere. Non nostrum est *κειμένοις ἐπεμβαίνειν.* Veniam etiam libenter dedero, si minus ea perspexerint, quæ a multis sæculis homines latuerunt, caligine et tenebris circumfusa. Nam ut concedam hæc, quomodo a me emendata sunt, ita a Joanne fuisse concepta; quod equidem haud facile crediderim; Suidæ tamen et

[u *τὰ πάντων ἀνεφάνη τῶν ἐγκοσμίων.* p. 23. ed. Cous.—D.]
[v Procli *Opp.* t. ii. p. 181. ed. Cous.—D.]
[w *τοῦτον θεόν.* ed. Cous.—D.] [x *τοῦ νοητοῦ.* ed. Cous.—D.]
[y *ἔρως, φησὶ, καί.* ed. Cous.—D.]
[z *μεθεκτοῦ.* ex cod. Lobeckius, quem vide, *Aglaoph.* t. i. p. 495.—D.]
[a *Emend.* xii. 2. apud Grut. *Fac. Art.* t. iii. p. 237.—D.]
[b " Pauli me Leop. scrinia comp." ed. Oxon.—D.]
[c *Var. Lect.* i. 26. apud Grut. *Fac. Art.* t. iii. p. 736.—D.]

Cedreni temporibus depravatum esse hunc Malelæ locum illud argumento est, quod hi interpretamenta duntaxat ex nostro afferant, de verbis Orphei *οὐδὲ γρύ*. Illud autem mihi videor satis certo scire, non te expectare, ut vim verbi *Ἠρικεπαῖος* et naturam explicem:[z] tune ut ineptas plerumque et cassas etymologias consectari me velis? Dabitur jusjurandum, ne ab Orpheo quidem ipso hoc fieri potuisse. Scire prius aveo, unde illa vulgaria, *Διόνυσος, Ἥφαιστος, Ποσειδῶν*. *Διόνυσος*, ait Orpheus apud Macrobium,[a] *ἀπὸ τοῦ δινεῖσθαι* originem ducit:

Πρῶτος δ' εἰς φάος ἦλθε, Διώνυσος δ' ἐπεκλήθη,
Οὕνεκα δινεῖται κατ' ἀπείρονα μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον.

Ride, et ad hoc exemplum crede alia fuisse dicturum. Nec quidem de significatione *τοῦ Ἠρικεπαίου* belle convenit scriptoribus. Secundum Malelam, Suidam[b] et Cedrenum est *ζωοδοτήρ*. Nosti hos tres, quam ad unum redeant denique. At Nonno in *συναγωγῇ ἱστοριῶν*[c] Phanes est *ζωοδοτήρ*. Ericepæus aliam vim habet nescio quam. *Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὸν* (*τὸν Φάνητα*) *ἔφορον εἶναι τῆς ζωογόνου δυνάμεως, ὁμοίως καὶ*[d] *τὸν Ἠρικεπαῖον λέγουσιν ἑτέρας ἔφορον εἶναι δυνάμεως*. Quamobrem, si sapiam, non operam perdam in etymologia hac inquirenda: magis ex usu fuerit, in quibus primum institi vestigiis pergere; et siqua restent Orphica apud Malelam, quæ correctione opus habeant, pro virili restituere.

Sic igitur refingo locum, quem habes p. 89.

Ὦ ἄνα, Λητοῦς υἱ',[e] *ἑκατηβόλε Φοῖβε κραταιὲ,*
Πανδερκὲς, θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσων,

[z Confer nostrum in Addendis, et in Epist. ad Bernard. *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 541, 543, 546, 550.; Gesnerum in *Orph.* p. 260. ed. Herman.; Lobeckium in *Aglaoph.* t. i. p. 470.—D.]

[a *Saturn.* i. 18. *Orph.* p. 464. ed. Herman.—D.]

[b In v. *Φάνης*.—D.]

[c Ad calcem Greg. Naz. *in Jul.* p. 154. ed. Mont. 1610.—D.]

[d *δὲ καί*. ed. Mont.—D.]

[e *Ὁ ἄναξ, Λητοῦς υἱὲ*. Mal. p. 88.—D.]

Ἠέλιε, χρυσέαισιν ἀειρόμενε[f] *πτερύγεσσιν,*
Δωδεκάτην δὴ[g] *τήνδε παραί σεο ἔκλυον ὀμφὴν,*
Σεῦ φαμένου, σὲ δέ γ' αὐτὸν,[h] *ἐκηβόλε, μάρτυρα θείην.*

Tertio autem versui simillimus et maxime geminus ejusdem scriptoris est alius in *Hymno ad Protogonum:*

Πρωτογόνον καλέω διφυῆ, μέγαν, αἰθερόπλαγκτον,
Ὠογενῆ, χρυσέαισιν[i] *ἀγαλλόμενον πτερύγεσσιν.*

At vir bonus Joannes, atque item Cedrenus, ne in librarios culpam hanc transferas, *τὴν πτέρυγα* arbitrabantur esse generis virilis. *En cor Zenodoti, en jecur Cratetis!*[j]

Multo vero gravius affectus est locus pag. 92. ita poetæ verba non modo cum interpretamentis Malelæ confusa sunt atque commixta; sed et insuper mendis obsita et cooperta. Illa quidem certe *μὴ διὰ μηδὲν* veritus est Cedrenus describere, quippe quæ nullo prorsus modo intellexerit. At memini vidisse Excerpta quædam manu Patricii Junii ex Chronico quodam penes Cl. Seldenum manuscripto: ubi inter alia ejusdem farinæ hæc Orphica habebantur, corrupta ea quidem et mutila; nihilominus in quibus extarent vestigia veræ lectionis: siquidem ibi scriptum erat *μὴ διὰ μὰ μηδέν.* Proinde de hoc loco mihi nulla dubitatio est, quin in versiculos reponi debeat ad hoc exemplum:

Θῆρές τ' οἰωνοί τε, βροτῶν τ' ἀλιτήρια φῦλα,[k]
Ἄχθεα γῆς, εἴδωλα τετυγμένα, μηδαμὰ[l] *μηδὲν*
Εἰδότες, οὔτε κακοῖο προσερχομένοιο νοῆσαι
Φράδμονες, οὔτ' ἄποθεν μάλ' ἀποστρέψαι[m] *κακότητος,*

[f *χρυσέοισιν ἀερόμενε.* Mal. p. 89.—*χρυσέῃσιν. Orph.* p. 490. ed. Herman. et sic Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[g *δὲ*, et *παρὰ σεῖο.* Mal.—D.]

[h *σεῖο φαμένου, σὲ δ' αὐτὸν*, et *θείη.* Mal.—*σεῦ φαμένοιο, σὲ δ' αὐτόν.* Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[i *χρυσέῃσιν. Orph.* p. 260. ed. Herman.—D.]

[j Bibaculus apud Sueton. *De Ill. Gramm.* p. 959. ed. Ouden.—D.]

[k *Θῆρές τε, οἰωνοί τε, βροτῶν ταλεῖτε οἷα φῦλα.* Mal. p. 91.—D.]

[l *μὴ διά.* Mal. p. 92.—D.]

[m *οὔτε ποῖον μάλλα προτρέψαι.* Mal.—D.]

Οὔτ' ἀγαθοῦ παρεόντος ἐπιστρέψαι τε καὶ ἔρξαι[n]
Ἴδριες, ἀλλὰ μάτην ἀδαήμονες,[o] *ἀπρονόητοι.*

Ad hunc Orphicorum numerum non dubito adscribere quæ extant pag. 30. etsi ea Mercurio Trismegisto attribuant Malelas, Suidas, Cedrenus, Auctor *Chronici Paschalis*, et de quo postmodum plura MS. Baroccianus. Scilicet ab auctoribus multo plus idoneis, S. Justino in *Paræenetica ad Græcos*, et S. Cyrillo *adversus Julianum* ad Orphea *ἐν τοῖς ὅρκοις* referuntur: ubi etiam veram hujus *λέξεως* scripturam offendes. Malelas enim cum suo grege antiquam adeo hic consuetudinem obtinent, ut nihil sentiant. Proxime autem ad Joannis verba accedes, si ita legeris:

Οὐρανὸν ὁρκίζω σε, θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφὸν ἔργον,
Ὁρκίζω σ' αὐδὴν πατρὸς, ἣν ἐφθέγξατο πρῶτον,
Ἡνίκα κόσμον ἅπαντα ἑῇ στηρίξατο βουλῇ.[p]

Ficta illa et commentitia oracula quæ habes p. 42. 79. et 172. adeo misere ac fœde accepta sunt, ita verba poetica in quotidianum sermonem immutata, ut vix invenias disjecti membra poetæ. Quamobrem in iis recolligendis redintegrandisque frustra operam conterere non libet; præsertim cum Joannes ipse satis aperte fateatur, se quæ *διὰ στίχων* scripta fuerant, *εἰς τὴν κοινὴν διάλεκτον* immutasse. Verum, ut beem aliquos tam optabili nuncio, est liber Oxonii annos abhinc puto DC. calamo exaratus; in quo non pauca extant Oracula Malelanis his germanissima: quæ si omnia hic in lucem proferam, quando bella occasio est, sane (quod in Græcorum proverbio est) patella videatur operculum inve-

[n Οὔτε et καὶ εἶρξαι, om. τε. Mal.—D.]

[o Ἴδρεες et ἀδήμονες. Mal.—Vide *Orph.* p. 490. ed. Herman.—D.]

[p Apud Mal. p. 30. Ὁρκίζω σε, οὐρανὲ, Θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφὸν ἔργον, Ἴλαος ἔσο· ὁρκίζω σε, φωνὴ πατρὸς, ἣν ἐφθέγξατο πρώτην, ἡνίκα κόσμον ἅπαντα ἐστηρίξατο βουλῇ. In *Orph.* p. 455. ed. Herman. sic, ex Justino et Cyrillo, hic ὅρκος legitur:

Οὐρανὸν ὁρκίζω σε, θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφοῦ ἔργον,
αὐδὴν ὁρκίζω σε πατρὸς, τὴν φθέγξατο πρῶτον,
ἡνίκα κόσμον ἅπαντα ἑαῖς στηρίξατο βουλαῖς. D.]

nisse. Spero etiam me gratiæ aliquantulum initurum ab hominibus illis perelegantis judicii, qui Oracula quæ vulgo feruntur Sibyllina tanquam ab anu fatidica Noachi filia fusa venerantur. Adeste igitur, O vere *σιβυλλιῶντες*, lotisque manibus sacra hæc tangite.

Χρησμοὶ καὶ Θεολογίαι Ἑλλήνων Φιλοσόφων.

I.

Ἑρμοῦ μεγίστου περὶ Παντοκράτορος.

Ἀκοιμήτου πυρὸς ὄμματι γρήγορε, δρόμον αἰθέρος ζωογονῶν, ἡλίου θέρμην κρατύνων, λαίλαπι μεθιστῶν νέφη, τοὔνομα μὴ χωρῶν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἄφθιτον ἀένναον πανεπίσκοπον ὄμμα· πατέρα τῶν ὅλων θεὸν ὄντα μόνον, ἀπ' οὐδενὸς ἔχοντα ἀρχὴν ἔγνωκα· ἕνα μετά σε ὄντα μόνον ἐκ σοῦ γεραίρω υἱὸν, ὃν ῥώμῃ ἀποῤῥήτῳ καὶ ὀξυτέρᾳ φωνῇ ἴδιον εὐθὺς ἀφθόνως καὶ ἀπαθῶς ἀπογεννήτως λόγον ἐγέννησεν (leg. *ἐγέννησας*) *θεὸν ὄντα, τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας, ὅς σου τοῦ πατρὸς τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ* (leg. *κατὰ*) *πᾶν ὁμοίαν φέρει, ὥστε ἐκεῖνος ἔν σοι, σὺ δὲ ἐν ἐκείνῳ, κάλλος ἔσοπτρον· ἀλληλεύφραντον πρόσωπον.* (leg. *ἀλληλευφράντων προσώπων.*)

II.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ Τριάδος.

Ἦν φῶς νοερόν ἐκ φωτὸς, ut apud Malelam habentur p. 29.

III.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ Προσευχή.

Ὁρκίζω σε, Οὐρανὲ, θεοῦ μεγάλου, &c. Vide Mal. p. 30.

IV.

Ἀριστοτέλους.

Ἀκάματος φύσις θεοῦ, γενέσεως οὐκ ἔχουσα ἀρχὴν, ἐξ αὐτῆς δ' ὁ πανσθενὴς οὐσίωται λόγος.

V.

Σόλωνος Ἀθηναίου.

Οὐκ ἐφικτὸν μοί ἐστι ταῦτα πρὸς ἀμυήτους εἰπεῖν, οὔτε δὲ φανερῶς παραθέσθαι· πλὴν τοῦ νοεῖν ἀκούεται (leg. *τῷ νοεῖν ἀκούετε*) *ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κατ' οὐρανὸν μεγάλου * φλογὸς ὑπερβάλλων, ὃν τρέμουσιν οὐρανοὶ γαῖά τε καὶ θάλατται, αὐτοπάτωρ, ἀπάτωρ, τρισόλβιος.* Confer hæc cum Malelanis pag. 79.

VI.

Θουκυδίδου.

Τὸ ἓν τρία καὶ τὰ τρία ἕν, ἄσαρκον προσωπικόν. Γῆ τέτοκε τὸν οὐρανοῦ γεννήτορα.

VII.

Χίλωνος.

Γόνος ἐκ γόνου κατελθὼν γόνιμον ὕδωρ ἐποίησε. Τὸ ὑπέρτατον τῶν ὅλων αἴτιον ἐπινοεῖται οὐ φωτὶ καὶ πνεύματι, ἀλλ' ὡς πάντων θεὸς καὶ κύριος καὶ πατήρ.

VIII.

Πλουτάρχου.

Ὁ παλαιὸς νέος, καὶ ὁ νέος ἀρχαῖος, ὁ πατὴρ γόνος, καὶ ὁ γόνος πατήρ.

IX.

Ἀντιόχου Κολοφῶνος περὶ Τριάδος.

*Ἦν νοῦς εἷς πάντων νοερώτερος * εἰ δέ γε ἔστιν*
Τοῦ ἄπο παγγενέτης νοερὸς λόγος ἄφθιτος αἰεὶ
Υἱὸς ἀπαυγασμὸς νοεροῦ πατρὸς, εἷς ἅμα πατρὶ,
*Ἐν μὲν ἐπωνυμίῃ * εἰ δέ γε ἔστιν ὡς ἀπὸ πατρὸς,*
Εἷς δὲ πέλων σὺν πατρὶ καὶ ἐξ ἑνὸς εἷς, μία τάξις,
Πατρὸς . . . . . ὁμοούσιος ἄφθιτος αἰεὶ
Πνεύματι σὺν πρώτῳ ἁγίῳ καὶ σπέρματος ἀρχή.

Uno verbo, ne nescias, te monitum velim in libro MS. sic legi: *τοῦ ἀποπαγγενέτης νοερώτερος λόγος ἄφθιτος υἱὸς ἀπαύγασμα.* Sed nihil erat facilius, quam in versus concinnare. Quivis etiam emendare possit *Κολοφωνίου* vel *ἐκ Κολοφῶνος.*[p] Illud fortasse plusculum habet difficultatis, quisnam sit ille Antiochus conjectura assequi. Et profecto nimis velim extaret Nicandri Colophonii liber *περὶ τῶν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ποιητῶν*· mirum enim, ni ex animi sententia hoc negotium conficeremus. Nunc vero, quandoquidem iste liber, ut alia omnia *καλὰ*, vel flammis, vel humore, vel inertibus tineis consumtus est; eum optimum vatem arbitremur, qui illud in re tam ancipiti protulerit, quod sit veri simillimum. Opportune autem venit in mentem Xenophani illi Colophonio filium fuisse nomine Antiochum, quem res Siculas et Italicas scripsisse multi commemorant. Verum accidit perincommode, quod is etsi patre natus Colophonio, tamen nescio quî Syracusius vocetur. Alius proinde quatiendus est funis. Placetne ut pro Antiocho reponatur Antiphanes? Athenæus, lib. vii.[q] *Μνημονεύει αὐτοῦ Ἀντιφάνης ὁ Κολοφώνιος ἐν τῇ Θηβαΐδι λέγων οὕτως,*

Ἢ ὕκκην, ἢ ἵππον, ἢ ὃν κίχλην καλέουσιν.

Sed mihi crede, nusquam fuit gentium Antiphanes ille Colophonius: quippe, quod a doctissimo Casaubono non animadversum esse demiror, pro commentitio isto Antiphane reponendus est Antimachus, notissimus auctor *Thebaidos* et *Lydes*, uti memorant ipse Athenæus alibi, *Etymologicon*, Hesychius, Suidas, Quintilianus, aliique bene multi. Huic autem Antimacho vix equidem dubito quin putidos hos versus affingere voluerint. Quo quidem consilio nihil in-

[p "Cæterum apud Joannem Damascenum quod Malalas vocatur *Ἰωάννης Ἀντιοχείας*, non patriarcham, sed civem Antiochensem intelligendum esse assentior Hodio Proleg. s. viii.: quomodo dictum *Ἀντιόχου Κολοφῶνος* in opusculo MS. Oxoniensi fefellit Bentleium Epistola ad Millium." Lud. Dindorfius, Præf. ad *Mal. Chron.* p. vii.—D.]

[q t. iii. p. 114. ed. Schw.—D.]

consultius esse potuit aut dementius. Proclus in *Commentario Timæi* distinguens poeticam ἔνθουν ἀπὸ τῆς τεχνικῆς, illius exemplum τοὺς χρησμοὺς, hujus τὸ Ἀντιμάχειον ponit. Adeo ut Antimachum χρησμῳδοῦντα fingere, sit prorsus ἄνω ποταμῶν. Totus erat Antimachus in arte et opera: nihil habuit ἐξ ἐνθουσιασμοῦ, nihil ex afflatu furoris, et cœlesti illo mentis instinctu, sine quo nullum poema sani coloris, nedum Oracula nasci possint.

X.

Ἐρώτησις Ἰάσονος βασιλέως τῶν Ἀργωναυτῶν εἰς τὸ Πύθιον τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος.

Προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, Προφῆτα Τιτὰν, et quæ sequuntur; ut habet Malelas p. 94.

XI.

Πλάτωνος.

Γενετὸς οὐδεὶς ἱκανὸς γνώμης ἀφανοῦς ἰδεῖν αἰσθητήριον. φύσις γὰρ μόνου θεοῦ ὡς αἰτίου τοῦ παντὸς γυμνὴν ψυχὴν δυναμένου (leg. δυναμένη) ἰδεῖν· εἷς γὰρ αἴτιος τοῦ παντὸς, εἷς καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' οἷος (leg. ἄλλος) ὁ εἷς, καί ποτε οὗτος ὁ εἷς οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ, ἀΐδιος γὰρ ὁ εἷς καὶ συναΐδιος.

XII.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ περὶ Χριστοῦ.

Ὀψὲ ποτέ τις ἐπὶ τὴν πολυσχεδῆ[r] ταύτην ἐλάσει γῆν, καὶ δίχα σφάλματος σὰρξ γενήσεται, ἀκαμάτοις θεότητος ὅροις ἀνιάτων παθῶν λύσει φθορὰν, καὶ τοῦτο φθόνος γενήσεται ἐξ ἀπίστου λαοῦ καὶ πρὸς ὕψος κρεμασθήσεται ὡς θανάτοι καταδίκως (leg. θανάτῳ κατάδικος) πάντα πράσας (leg. πράξας sive δράσας) πείσεται.

[[r] πολυσχιδῆ, Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 431.—D.]

XIII.

Χρησμὸς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δοθεὶς ἐν Δελφοῖς περὶ Χριστοῦ.

Εἷς με βιάζεται οὐράνιον φῶς, καὶ ὁ παθὼν θεός ἐστιν, καὶ οὐ θεότης ἔπαθεν αὐτὴ, ἄμφω γὰρ βροτόσωμος καὶ ἄβροτος αὐτὸς θεὸς ἤδη καὶ ἀνὴρ, πάντα φέρων παρὰ πατρὸς ἔχων τε τῆς μητρὸς ἅπαντα, πατρὸς μὲν ἔχων ζώων ἄλκει, μητρὸς δὲ θνητῆς σταυρὸν, τάφον, ὕβριν ἀνιήτου καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ποτεχευᾶ τὰ δάκρυα θερμὰ ὁ πέντε χιλιάδας ἐκ πέντε πυρῶν κορέσαι (l. *σας*) *τὸ γὰρ θέλεν ἄβροτος ἄλκει. Χριστὸς ὁ ἐμὸς θεός ἐστιν ἐν ξύλῳ τανυθῇ ὃς* (leg. *τανυσθεὶς*) *θάνεν. ὃς ἐκ ταφῆς εἰς πολλῶν ὅλκων.*

Miris modis hæc perturbata sunt; magnam tamen partem in versus suos nullo negotio redigi possunt in hunc modum:

Εἷς με βιάζεται οὐράνιον φῶς————
Καὶ ὁ παθὼν θεός ἐστι, καὶ οὐ θεότης πάθεν αὐτή.
Ἄμφω γὰρ βροτόσωμος ἔην ἠδ' ἄβροτος αὐτὸς
————θεὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνὴρ,
Πάντα φέρων παρὰ πατρὸς, ἔχων τῆς μητρὸς ἅπαντα
Ἐκ πατρὸς μὲν ἔχων ζώην ἄλκει————
Μητρὸς δὲ θνητῆς σταυρὸν, τάφον, ὕβριν, ἀνίην.
Τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ποτε χεύατο δάκρυα θερμά.

XIV.

Ἀστάνου περὶ τῆς Θεοτόκου.

Τιμήσωμεν τὴν Μαριὰμ, ὡς καλῶς κρύψασαν τὸ μυστήριον.

Sine dubio loco *Ἀστάνου* emendandum est *Ὀστάνου*. Ostanes magus et Zoroastres etiam indoctis cognitissimi. Theodoro Meliteniotæ *Præfatione in Astronomiam* non Ostanes dicitur, sed *Ὀτάνης*. Quæ fortasse vera scriptura est: nam et apud Herodotum non unus est Otanes Persa: et vero Magus ille natione fuit Chaldæus. Theodori locum describam, quod ibi plurimorum Magorum nomina videas,

quos alibi frustra quæsieris. *Ἐν οἷς (Χαλδαίοις) ἄλλοι τε πλεῖστοι γεγόνασιν ἀξιόλογοι ἄνδρες, καὶ μάλιστα Ζωροάστρης, καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον Ὀτάνης, ὅ τε Κιδηνᾶς, καὶ Ναβουριανὸς, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ὁ Σουδῖνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Σέλευκος ἀπὸ Σελευκίας, Χαλδαῖος καὶ οὗτός ἐστιν.*[s]

XV.

Θοῦλις ὁ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεὺς ἐπαρθεὶς τοῖς κατορθώμασιν ἠρώτησεν εἰς τὸ μαντεῖον τοῦ Εὐριπίδου περὶ αὐτοῦ οὕτως.

Φράσον μοι, πυρισθενὲς, &c. ut Malelas p. 26. [27.]

Hominem sane festivum, qui Euripidem *χρησμολογοῦντα* nobis exhibuit. Quidni autem, inquies? cujus ex *μαντείῳ* hoc editum est,

Μάντις δ' ἄριστος ὅστις εἰκάζει καλῶς,[t]

oraculum quidem, quo nihil verius ac sapientius; quale nunquam aut Bacis[u] fudit, aut comicus iste Glanis, aut

Pythia, quæ tripode ex Phœbi lauroque profata est.[v]

Sed extra jocum: sine controversia corrigendum est *τοῦ Σαράπιδος*· cui Canobi templa dicata sunt; etiam Alexandriæ et Memphi. Narrat Strabo[w] miris quosdam laudibus efferre *τὰς ἀρετὰς τῶν τοῦ Σαράπιδος ἐν Κανώβῳ λογίων*. Hæc scripseram, cum sero animadverti apud Suidam in voce *Θοῦλις* ita legi *αὐτολεξεὶ*, uti prius ex conjectura emendaveram.

Dubitantem me et quo proxime me vertam circumspectantem ad se vocat Sophocles, indignis sane modis a Joanne acceptus p. 47. *Ὁ γὰρ σοφώτατος Σοφοκλῆς δρᾶμα ἐξέθετο*

[s Theod. Mel. *Procem. in Astron.* (ad calcem Claud. C. Ptolem. *De Jud. Fac.* &c. p. 228. ed. 1663.—D.]

[t Eurip. *Frag. Incert. Trag.* cxxviii. ed. Matt.—D.]

[u De Bacide et Glanide, vide Aristoph. *Equit.* v. 999. ed. Bekk. et Casaubonum ad l.—D.]

[v Lucret. I. 740. ubi —" lauroque *profatur*."—D.]

[w p. 1136. ed. Falc. ubi *τὰς . . ἀρ. τῶν ἐνταῦθα λογ.*—D.]

καὶ ποιητικῶς εἶπεν ὅτι (ὁ Τειρεσίας) τὴν Παλλάδα εἶδε λουομένην καὶ γυνὴ ἐγένετο. Ego verò quovis pignore contenderim nihil usquam de fabella ista profectum a Sophocle, quanquam ab aliis passim memoretur. Cum enim omnes fere titulos Sophoclæorum dramatum beneficio Grammaticorum veterum habeamus, nullum est ubi Tiresiæ persona locum habere possit, præterquam una Trilogia, *Œdipus Tyrannus, Antigone,* et *Œdipus in Colono:* sic enim sentio: sive Tetralogiam malis, accedo; ut fabula satyrica, sicut omnes omnium præter *Cyclopem* Euripidis, periisse videatur. Quanquam enim affirmet Suidas,[x] (*ὅτι ὁ Σοφοκλῆς*) *ἦρξε τοῦ δρᾶμα πρὸς δρᾶμα ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ τετραλογίαν·* scimus tamen ex didascaliis non ex omni parte verum hoc esse. Vide modo Aristophanem Grammaticum in Argumento *Medeæ* Euripidis.[y] Atqui haud commemini fabellam istam de Tiresia in trinis illis narrari, neque ibi reperiri posse arbitror. Prima hæc est erga Sophoclem contumelia. Deinceps, *Ὅθεν,* ait, *ἐξέθετο ... Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ συγγράμμασι ταῦτα ἀληθείας εἶναι. Εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς ὃς τὸν οὐρανὸν,* &c. O hominis stuporem, et *ἰδιωτείαν* meram! Apud auctorem, unde hæc habuit Antiochensis, sine dubio scriptum erat ad hoc exemplum: *Καθὼς ὁ Σοφοκλῆς εἶπεν ἐν ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν εἷς ἐστι θεός.* Homo stolidus interpunctione falsa jugulavit versum, misereque disperdidit.[z] Nimirum ab *ἀλη-*

[x v. Σοφοκλῆς.—D.]

[y "Immo certum est, etiam post primam actionem tetralogiis dimicasse Sophoclem, quod præter Triptolemum docuit Nausicaam satyricam et alia satyrica dramata; idemque apparet e didascalia Byzantii Aristophanis Argum. Eurip. Med. Ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου Ἄρχοντος (Ol. lxxxvii. 1.) *κατὰ τὴν πζ' Ὀλυμπιάδα. Πρῶτος Εὐφορίων, δεύτερος Σοφοκλῆς, τρίτος Εὐριπίδης· Μήδεια, Φιλοκτήτης, Δίκτυς, Θερισταὶ Σάτυροι· οὐ σώζονται.* Hinc est quod Bentleius Epist. ad Mill. p. 462. ed. Lips. dicit: *Scimus tamen ex didascaliis non ex omni parte verum hoc esse. Vide modo Aristophanem Grammaticum in Argumento Medeæ Euripidis.* Nempe et Bentleius eodem, quo alii, errore nimis generatim cepit Suidæ verba, &c." Boeckhius, *Græc. Trag. Prin.* &c. p. 105.—Errorem suum de trilogia sive tetralogia, *Œd. Tyr., Antig.* et *Œd. in Col.,* Bentleium in *Addendis* agnoscentem videas.—D.]

[z "Nescio an verba Malelæ corrupta sint; et *ἀληθείας εἶναι* depravata sint ex *ἀληθείαισιν,* ut *αι* ex *ε* sequente natum sit." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364. —D.]

θείαισι distinctionem posuit, cum oratio post *εἶπε* sustineri debuerit. Sed efficiam ut posthac hi versiculi sano saltem pede possint incedere. Sic igitur emendo:

Ἐν ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν εἷς ἐστιν θεὸς,
Ὃς οὐρανόν τ'[z] ἔτευξε καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν,
Πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδμα κἀνέμων[a] βίας.
Θνητοί τε πολλὸν[b] καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι
Ἱδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν,[c]
Θεῶν[d] ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων ἢ χαλκέων[e]
Ἢ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ 'λεφαντίνων[f] τύπους.
Θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ κενὰς[g] πανηγύρεις
Τεύχοντες οὕτως[h] εὐσεβεῖν νομίζομεν.

Ita fere leguntur apud Justinum, Clementem, Eusebium, Theodoritum, et partim Athenagoram; adeo ut demirer interpretem Chilmeadum, hominem sane pereruditum, in luce tam clara minus solito perspexisse. Sed non te celabo, quod pace sanctorum virorum dictum velim, vehementer me suspicari non esse hæc a Sophocle. Id adeo cur in animum inducam, si me interroges; dico, permirum mihi præter alia videri, tam illustrem locum Ecclesiasticis solis incurrisse in oculos, aliorum omnium aciem effugisse. Quî factum, uti dormitaret hic Plutarchi diligentia? Quî Porphyrium præterire potuit *περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψύχων* tam insigne testimonium

[z τ' om. Mal.—D.]
[a δὲ χαρωποῦ, et καὶ ἀνέμων. Mal.—D.] [b δὲ πολύ. Mal.—D.]
[c 'Ιδυσάμεθα πημιμάτων παραψυχάς. Mal.—D.]
[d Θεῷ. Mal.—D.] [e καὶ ξύλων. Mal.—D.]
[f ἐλεφαντίνων. Mal.—D.] [g καινάς. Mal.—D.]
[h οὕτως om. Mal.—Clementem (p. 63 et 717. ed. Pott.) maxime secutus, sic locum exhibuit Brunckius, Soph. Frag. ex Incert. Trag. li.:

Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθ. . . . .
. . . . . .
Θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίαν πλανώμενοι
. . . . . .
. . . . . ἢ χαλκέους
Ἢ χρυσοτεύκτους, ἢ 'λεφαντίνους τύπους·
Θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ καλὰς πανηγύρεις
Νέμοντες . . . . . D.]

adversus τῶν θυσιῶν τὰς παρανόμους σφαγὰς, ut ad hunc locum ait Theodoritus? Ubi tu, Stobæe, cessasti, literarum oblivio? tu, qui tot forulos bibliothecarum excussisti, Sophoclis autem et Euripidis monumenta studiose præter cætera lectitasti. Adeone paucos e Patribus,—quid Patres autem dico? unumne aliquem tenebrionem, qui supposita persona librum ediderit (ut et olim et hodie nonnullorum opinio est, neque adeo injuria) cæteris omnibus perspicaciorem et diligentiorem fuisse? Clemens enim aperte et ingenue fatetur Hecatæi se fidem secutum, apud ipsum Sophoclem omnino non legisse. Ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς, ait, *Strom.* V.,[h] ὥς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συντάξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἄβραμον καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. Illud autem exploratum habeo tam a Justino et Clemente Patres alios accepisse, quam Justinum et Clementem commentitii ejus Hecatæi auctoritate tradidisse. Quem ad hominem demum, et quam nulla fide res redierit, vides. Ille ne ut Sophocli versiculos aliquot vereretur affingere, qui illum ipsum, quo eos adduxit, librum ediderit simulata persona Hecatæi? Ipsa præterea oratio de se facit indicium. Non agnosco illud χαλκέων, et πολλὸν sumptum, ut aiunt, adverbialiter, esse hominis Attici, aut in tragœdia ferri posse.[i] Qualis enim hæc foret confusio dialectorum, et ut ait ille,[j] sartago loquendi? Oportuit enim πολὺ et χαλκῶν. Χαλκέων quidem a χαλκεὺς Attice dixeris; minime gentium a χαλκοῦς, non magis mehercule quam ἀγαπάει vel Ἀριστοτέλεος. Χρύσεα, ait Phrynichus,[k] ἀργύρεα, κυάνεα, χάλκεα, ταῦτα Ἰακὰ διαιρούμενα· χρὴ οὖν λέγειν χρυσᾶ, ἀργυρᾶ, κυανᾶ τὸν Ἀττικίζοντα. Χρυσοῦς λέγε, τὸ γὰρ χρύσεος Ἰακὸν, ὡσαύτως καὶ ἀργυροῦς, ... χαλκοῦς, κυανοῦς, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. Rogo denique, cui personæ hæc oratio conveniat? Quave Sophocles fiducia die festo ludorum (non alias enim in scena quam Panathenæis ac

[h p. 717. ed. Pott.—D.]

[i πολλὸν Soph. *Antig.* 86.: verum ibi πλεῖον legebat Porsonus ad Eurip. *Hec.* 624.—D.]

[j Persius, i. 80.—D.]

[k ed. 1517. fol. ult. Paulo aliter legitur locus in ed. Lobeck. p. 207., ubi vide Pauwii notam.—D.]

trinis Liberalibus tragœdiæ docebantur) illos ipsos dies festos et ludos solennes in contemptionem adduceret? Istuccine se impune laturum speraret?[l] Nonne Æschyli periculum cautiorem eum faceret, qui, quod in *Sisypho* opinor *πετροκυλιστῇ* ad Cereris mysteria curiosius videretur alludere, nisi ad aram Bacchi confugisset, illico trucidatus esset in scena: postea etiam in Areopago de capite suo causam dixit? Habes, amice, suspiciones nostras:[m] tu tuique similes rem cognoscite, et sententiam ferte; non *Βεκκεσέληνοι* quidam, *πολυμαθεῖς* sine pectore et mente,

ἀνέρες, ὧν τὸ κέαρ
Παλῶ σέσακται καὶ δυσεκνίπτω τρυγός.[n]

Præclare vero actum est cum Sophocle, quod a *χρονορράφῳ* nostro non nisi semel ad falsum testimonium dicendum citatus sit: Euripides autem, qui Malelæ erat paulo familiarior, gravissimas istius consuetudinis pœnas sustinuit; adeo quidem ut non minus incommodo hospite hoc Antiochensi, quam olim Promeri canibus usus esse videatur. Non erit, opinor, ab instituto nostro alienum, si locos omnes accuratius aliquantum examinem, in quibus Euripidis mentio fit: et, quoad ejus facere potero, fabularum titulos, quo singuli quique loci referuntur, ostendam. Dabitur fortasse occasio ex interioribus literis aspergendi aliquid: memores tamen erimus, ut spondeo, verbi veteris, quo admonemur

Τῇ χειρὶ σπείρειν, μηδ' ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ.[o]

[l "Aliud argumentum adferre potuerat Bentleius, Sophoclem scilicet de Diis patriis longe reverentius semper loqui, quam ut hujus *ῥήσεως* auctor esse possit." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[m Confer nostrum in Addendis, et in Epist. ad Bernard. *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 541, 543, 547.—De his pseudo-Sophoclis versibus egerunt Jortinus, *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* vol. i. p. 309.; Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 526.; Boeckhius, *Gr. Trag. Prin.* p. 148.—D.]

[n Cercides apud Stobæum. Vulgo *τρυγί*: vide *Floril.* t. i. p. 129. ed. Gaisf.—D.]

[o . . . *γελάσασα ἐκείνη τῇ χειρὶ δεῖν ἔφη* [Pindaro Corinna] *σπείρειν ἀλλὰ μὴ ὅλῳ τῷ θυλάκῳ.* Plutarch. *Athenienses Bello*, &c.—*Mor.* t. ii. p. 294. ed. Wyttenb.—D.]

Quæ igitur habes pag. 39. *Περὶ ἧς (Δανάης) ἐμυθολόγησεν Εὐριπίδης ὁ σοφώτατος ἐν τῇ συντάξει τοῦ αὐτοῦ δράματος*, et quæ sequuntur, e fabula *Danae* desumpta sunt. Laudat hanc Pollux lib. 4. cap. 16.[p] Stobæus autem non semel, ut et aliam Sophoclis similiter inscriptam. Harum alterutram, magis tamen Euripideam, Latine convertit Nævius, cujus *Danae* Nonio Marcello citatur. Plutarchus *Consolatoria ad Apollonium*:[q] *Ὁ δὲ παραμυθούμενος τὴν Δανάην δυσπενθοῦσαν Δίκτυς φησί,*

Δοκεῖς τὸν ᾅδην σῶν τὶ φροντίζειν γόων,
Καὶ παῖδ' ἀνήσειν τὸν σὸν, εἰ θέλοις στένειν;
Παῦσαι· βλέπουσα δ' εἰς τὰ τῶν πέλας κακὰ
Ῥᾴων γένοι' ἄν, εἰ λογίζεσθαι θέλοις,
Ὅσοι τε δεσμοῖς ἐκμεμόχθηνται βροτῶν,
Ὅσοι τε γηράσκουσιν ὀρφανοὶ τέκνων,
Τούς τ' ἐκ μεγίστης ὀλβίας τυραννίδος
Τὸ μηδὲν ὄντας· ταῦτά σε σκοπεῖν χρεών.

Erravit eruditissimus Grotius in *Excerptis*,[r] cum in versu quarto reposuit *Ῥᾷον φέροις ἄν*. Nihil enim magis usu tritum, quam *ῥᾴων εἶναι, melius habere, hilariore animo esse, convalescere*. Etiam pueri hoc sciunt. Erravit, cum in versiculo quinto emendare conatus est *ἐμμεμόχθηνται*. Non enim magis *μοχθοῦμαι* dixeris, cum *μοχθῶ* sit verbum neutrum, quam *πάσχομαι* aut *κάμνομαι*. Sine dubio scriptum oportuit

Ὅσοι τε δεσμοῖς ἐμμεμόχλευνται βροτῶν,

vel

Ὅσοι τε δεσμοῖσι μεμόχλευνται βροτῶν.[s]

Erravit denique, cum locum hunc ad hanc, de qua agimus, *Danaen* referendum putavit, qui omnino ex Euripidis

[p p. 415. ed. Hemst.—D.]
[q *Mor.* t. i. p. 294. ed. Wyttenb.—Eurip. *Dict.* Frag. 1. ed. Matt.—D.]
[r p. 381.—D.]
[s Vulgatam (probante Matthiæo) tuetur Wyttenb., *Animadv. in Plut.* &c. t. vi. p. 352., vertens *in vinculis defatigati, confecti, consumti, contabuerunt.*—D.]

Dictye accersitus est:[r] de quo consule Stobæum, et alios. Aristophanes Grammaticus in Argumento *Medeæ*. *Ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Πυθιοδώρου*[s] *ἄρχοντος κατὰ τὴν πζ' Ὀλυμπιάδα. Πρῶτος Εὐφορίων, δεύτερος Σοφοκλῆς, τρίτος Εὐριπίδης. Μήδεια, Φιλοκτήτης, Δίκτης,*[t] *Θερισταί. Σάτυρος οὐ σώζεται.* Scribe *Δίκτυς, Θερισταὶ σάτυροι οὐ σώζονται.* i. e. *Θερισταὶ δρᾶμα σατυρικόν.* Ita loqui solent. Cave enim credas *τὸ σάτυροι* esse partem inscriptionis. Ita Sophoclis fabula *Κωφοὶ σάτυροι.* Scholiastes Nicandri[u] simpliciter *Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Κωφοῖς.* Sic ejusdem *Ἰχνευταὶ σάτυροι,* quemadmodum apud Pollucem[v] est legendum pro *Ἰχνευταὶ Σατύρων.* Athenæus[w] non apposito fabulæ discrimine, *Σοφ. ἐν Ἰχνευταῖς.* Sic *Ἰοφῶν . . . . ἐν Αὐλῳδοῖς σατύροις* apud Clementem:[x] sic Æschylus *ἐν Κήρυξι σατύροις* apud Pollucem:[y] ita enim emendo pro *κήρυξι σατυρικοῖς.* Photius in Lexico manu scripto: *Πυρσοκόρσου λέοντος, Αἰσχύλος ἐν Κήρυξι*[z] *σατύροις.* Ex quo restituendus Hesychii locus: *Πυρσοκουρσολέοντος, πυῤῥοκεφάλου, ξανθοτρίχου*: lege, ut apud Photium. Cum autem nomen fabulæ cujuspiam sit numero singulari; tunc *σατυρικὴ* dicunt et *σατυρικός.* Potuit autem Grotius erratum suum resciscere ex Fragmento illo *Danaæ,* quod primus in lucem edidit de literis optime meritus Hieronymus Commelinus. Ibi dramatis personæ sunt Mercurius, Danae, Nutrix, Acrisius, Minerva, Nuncius, Chorus: Dictys autem minime comparet. In *ἀποσπασματίῳ* illo sic vulgo legitur non longe a principio:[a]

. . . . . *κᾆτα πῶς κείνη ποτὲ*
Εὐνὴν κρυφαίαν γνοῦσα καὶ μὴ γνοῦσα δὴ
Ὑπόπετρον λέοντα τέξεται πατρί.

[r "Grotium sequutus Barnes. in nota, *Hunc,* ait, *locum alii ad Dictyn fabulam referendum putant:* cur Bentleium non nominat? qui in Epist. ad Jo. Millium, Barnesio lecta, . . . solus monstraverat, locum ex Euripidis esse Dictye repetitum." Valcken., *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 5.—D.]

[s l. *Πυθοδώρου.*—D.]

[t l. *Δίκτυς.*—D.]

[u Ad *Ther.* 343.—D.]

[v p. 1180. ed. Hemst.—D.]

[w Lib. ii. c. lxii. t. i. p. 241. ed. Schw.—D.]

[x p. 329. ed. Pott.—D.]

[y p. 1378. ed. Hemst.—D.]

[z *Κάρυξι.* ed. Pors.—D.]

[a v. 13.—Hoc Danaës fragmentum quin spurium sit non dubitarunt, ut alios taceam, Jacobsius, Elmsleius, Matthiæus.—D.]

Cum metri ratio, tum res ipsa flagitat, ut *ὑπόπτερον* scribamus, non *ὑπόπετρον*. Quis non alatum Perseum et in libris legit, et in pictis tabulis vidit? At interpres homo sane festivus ita convertit; *sub saxo natum leonem*. Nempe huic committas, siquid recte curatum velis.[a] Et tamen is ipse[b] est, ni fallor, qui bonam ætatis partem contrivit, ut Suidam foras extruderet mendis maculisque usquequaque obsitum, ut aliquando fortasse ostendemus.

Pag. 51. *Διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Εὐριπίδης . . . . τῶν Βακχῶν ἐξέθετο δρᾶμα, ὡς ἀπὸ Πενθέως εἰπὼν ταῦτα· Σεμέλη δὲ λοχευθεῖσα ἐκ βροτοῦ τινος, εἰς Ζῆνα φέρουσα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λέγει.* *Bacchæ* Euripidis etiam nunc supersunt. Illud autem mentitur Malelas, *ὡς ἀπὸ Πενθέως*: non Pentheus enim, verum Semelæ sorores *Ἰνὼ, κ' Αὐτονόα, χ' ἁ μαλοπάρῃος Ἀγαύα*[c] contumelias has ei dixerunt. Bacchus in Prologo:[d]

Ἐπεί μ' ἀδελφαὶ μητρὸς, ἃς ἥκιστ' ἐχρῆν,
Διόνυσον οὐκ ἔφασκον εἶναι τοῦ Διὸς,[e]
Σεμέλην δὲ νυμφευθεῖσαν ἐκ θνητοῦ τινος,
Εἰς Ζῆν' ἀναφέρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λέχους.

Pag. 58. *Ὁ γὰρ σοφώτατος Εὐριπίδης ποιητικῶς ἐξέθετο δρᾶμα, ὡς ὅτι ὁ Ζεὺς εἰς σάτυρον ἔφθειρε τὴν Ἀντιόπην.* Censeo supplendum esse *εἰς σάτυρον τρεφθεὶς ἔφθειρε*. Propter similitudinem duorum verborum accidit, ut fieri solet, ut librarius unum omitteret. Porro fabula *Antiopa*[f] memoratur ab Hesychio, Stobæo, aliis. Photius Patriarcha in Lexico MS. *Εὔκρας εὔκρατος εὐρυβροτοῖσιν. Εὔκρας οὐ γένοιτ' ἂν ἡδέως, ἐν Ἀντιόπῃ.* Lege *Εὔκρας, εὔκρατος· Εὐριπ. ἐν Ἀντιόπῃ· Βροτοῖσιν εὔκρας οὐ γένοιτ' ἂν ἡδέως.* Suidas: *Εὐκραὴς, ἀντὶ τοῦ εὔκρατος.* Scribe *Εὐκρὰς*, uti recte apud *Etymologicon Magnum*. *Antiopam* Latine

[a "Huic *mandes*, si quid recte curatum velis." Terent. *Ad.* III. iii. 18.—D.]
[b Æmilius Portus.—D.]
[c Theocr. *Idyl.* xxvi. 1.—D.]
[d v. 26.—D.]
[e vulgo *ἐκφῦναι Διός*.—D.]
[f "Bentleium miror Antiopam Euripidis leviter attigisse tantum." Valcken., *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 68.—D.]

docuit Pacuvius, de Græco Euripidis conversam: citantibus Charisio, Diomede, Servio, et Marcello. "In quo admiror," ait Cicero *De Finibus*,[g] "cur in gravissimis rebus non delectet eos patrius sermo, cum iidem fabellas Latinas ad verbum de Græcis expressas non inviti legant. Quis enim tam inimicus pæne nomini Romano est, qui Ennii *Medeam*, aut *Antiopam* Pacuvii spernat aut rejiciat? qui se iisdem Euripidis fabulis delectari dicat, Latinas oderit?"[h] Nosti illud Persii,[i]

> Sunt, quos Pacuviusque, et verrucosa moretur
> Antiopa, ærumnis cor luctificabile fulta.

Pag. 63. *Ὁ γὰρ σοφώτατος Εὐριπίδης ποιητικῶς ἐξέθετο δρᾶμα περὶ τοῦ Οἰδίποδος καὶ τῆς Ἰοκάστης καὶ τῆς Σφιγγός.* Œdipus et Jocasta in *Phœnissis* ad partes vocantur: quin et ibidem de Sphinge mentio fit non semel. Potuit igitur Antiochensis ad *Phœnissas* respicere, potuit ad fabulam *Œdipum*, quæ laudatur ab Hesychio, a Stobæo aliquoties, ab Erotiano.

Pag. 88. *Καὶ μετὰ Αἰσχύλον ἐβασίλευσεν αὐτῶν (τῶν Ἀθηναίων) Ἀκμαίων ἔτη δύο, περὶ οὗ Εὐριπίδης ὁ σοφώτατος δρᾶμα ἐξέθετο· καὶ μετὰ Ἀκμαίοντα ἐβασίλευσαν αὐτῶν ἄλλοι ΙΗ΄.* Amabo te, Syrisce, serione hæc an joco? quæ te enim larvæ atque intemperiæ agitabant,[j] cum hæc scriberes? *ποῦ τοι φρένες ἐκπεπότανται;*[k] *Ἀκμαίων* et *Ἀκμαίοντα* pro *Ἀλκμαίων* et *Ἀλκμαίωνα*? Muli sunt illa, non hominis. Simile peccatum est, quod de Alcmæone Atheniensi tragœdiam factam existimes. Siquidem ille est Alcmæo Argivus, Amphiarai filius, qui, quod Eriphylen matrem occi-

[g 1. 2. "In quibus hoc primum est, in quo *admirer*; cur," &c.—D.]

[h Vulgo "Latinas *litteras* oderit,"—quæ spuria suspicati sunt editores. —D.]

[i *Sat.* I. 77.—D.]

[j Terentii *Heaut.* III. ii. 30, 32., et Plauti *Aulul.* IV. iv. 15. respicit noster. —D.]

[k Theocr. *Idyl.* xi. 72. Ὦ Κύκλωψ, Κύκλωψ, *πᾷ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι*; —D.]

disset, furiis agitatus est. Inde scenæ argumentum est accersitum. Timocles comicus:[k]

Τοὺς γὰρ τραγῳδοὺς πρῶτον, εἰ βούλει, σκόπει,
Ὡς ὠφελοῦσι πάντας· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὢν[l] *πένης,*
Πτωχότερον αὐτοῦ καταμαθὼν τὸν Τήλεφον
Γενόμενον, ἤδη τὴν πενίαν ῥᾷον φέρει·
Ὁ νοσῶν δὲ μανικῶς, Ἀλκμαίων' ἐσκέψατο.

Antiphanes:[m]

. . . . . Μακάριόν ἐστιν ἡ τραγῳδία
Ποίημα κατὰ πάντ'. . . . .
. . . . . ἂν πάλιν
Εἴπῃ τις Ἀλκμαίωνα, καὶ τὰ παιδία
Πάντ' εὐθὺς εἴρηχ',[n] *ὅτι μανεὶς ἀπέκτονε*
Τὴν μητέρα.

Cicero *Academ.* 2.[o] "Quid? ipse Alcmæo tuus, qui negat cor sibi cum oculis consentire, nonne ibidem incitato furore; *Unde hæc flamma oritur?* et illa deinceps, *Incede, incede; adsunt, adsunt; me, me expetunt.* Quid, cum virginis fidem implorat? *Fer mi auxilium; pestem abige a me, Flammiferam hanc vim, quæ me excruciat. Cœruleo incinctæ angui*[p] *incedunt; Circumstant cum ardentibus tædis.*" Sed piget profecto in re certissima testibus usum esse non necessariis. Illud opinor auribus tuis, Milli, novum accedet; integram hujus dramatis inscriptionem esse *Ἀλκμαίων ὁ διὰ Ψωφῖδος*. Nisi fortasse geminum *Alcmæonem* Euripides ediderit,[q] aut

[k Athen. l. vi. c. ii. t. ii. p. 358. ed. Schw.—D.]
[l ὢν γάρ. ibid.—D.]
[m Athen. l. vi. c. i. t. ii. p. 355-6. ed. Schw.—D.]
[n εἴρηκεν. ibid.—D.]
[o cap. 28.—D.]
[p Sic correxerat et Columna ad Ennii *Frag.* Vulgo "*Cœruleæ* incinctæ *igni.*"—D.]
[q "Arg. [Eurip.] Alcest. in MS. Vat. No. 909. apud Dindorf. τὸ δρᾶμα ἐποιήθη ἰξ·. ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Γλαυκίνου ἄρχοντος. τὸ λ-. πρῶτον ἦν Σοφοκλῆς, δεύτερον Εὐριπίδης Κρήσσαις, Ἀλκμαίονι τῷ διαψωφίλῳ, Τηλέφῳ, Ἀλκήστιδι. . . . . From the mention of Ἀλκμαίονι (where we must read Ἀλκμαίωνι τῷ διὰ Ψωφῖδος), we learn that the suspicion of Bentley, Ep. ad Mill. p. 16. [ed. Cant.], that there were two dramas of the name, is confirmed. The present tragedy is the first, the Ἀλκμαίων which was exhibited after the death of Euripides was the second." Clinton's *Fasti Hellen., from the Earliest Accounts to the* LV. *Olymp.* (*Add. and Corr.*) p. 424.—D.]

iterum eundem, correctum scilicet et *διεσκευασμένον*. Quicquid est hujus, solus adeo me docuit Hesychius noster, et fortasse solum: alios, qui depravata ejus verba non poterant intelligere, non item. *Ἀργαίνειν, λευκαίνειν. Εὐριπίδης Ἀλκμαίωνι, διὰ ψηφῖδος ἀργαίνουσα, λευκαίνουσα, φοιτῶσα.* Censeo corrigendum esse, *Εὐριπίδης Ἀλκμαίωνι τῷ διὰ Ψωφῖδος·* tum notam distinctionis ponendam † *Ἀργαίνουσα, λευκαίνουσα, φοιβῶσα. Παρὰ δὲ τὸ ἀργὸν,* ait Eustathius ad *Odysseæ* secundum,[r] .... *καὶ ἀργάντες ταῦροι παρὰ Πινδάρῳ, καὶ ἀργαίνειν τὸ λευκαίνειν παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ ἐν Ἀλκμαίωνι.* Sive hæc Eustathius ab Hesychio, sive ab alio quopiam uterque transtulit, apparet hunc locum a multis jam sæculis fuisse depravatum. Quî factum alioquin, ut Eustathius tragœdiæ nomen mutilum protulerit, nisi quod in verbis sequentibus cerneret *οὐδὲν ὑγιές*. Idem Hesychius: *Ἀτενής. Ἥκω δ' ἀτενὴς ἀπ' οἴκων. Εὐριπίδης Ἀλκμαίωνι τῷ διὰ ψοφίδος συντείνασα.* Corrige sodes in hunc modum, *Εὐριπίδης Ἀλκμαίωνι τῷ διὰ Ψωφῖδος, συντείνασα. Ἀτενὴς,* ait, est *συντείνασα, festinans summa cum virium contentione.* Cujus significationis exempla quod haud temere reperiantur, propterea verbi sedes a Grammaticis indicata est *Ἀλκμαίων ὁ διὰ Ψωφῖδος.* Rationem porro hujus inscriptionis non diu neque frustra quæsiverit, qui in memoria habuerit Alcmæonem, quem antea contortorum anguium et ardentium tædaram verbera nusquam consistere paterentur, aliquando tandem ad sanam mentem in Psophide Arcadiæ rediisse. Videatur in *Arcadicis* Pausanias. Apollodorus lib. iii.[s] *Ἀλκμαίωνα δὲ μετῆλθεν Ἐριννὺς τοῦ μητρῴου φόνου, καὶ μεμηνὼς πρῶτον μὲν εἰς Ἀρκαδίαν πρὸς Οἰκλέα παραγίνεται, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ πρὸς*[t] *Ψωφίδα πρὸς Φηγέα· καθαρθεὶς δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀρσινόην γαμεῖ τὴν τούτου θυγατέρα.* Jam monui emendandum esse *Ψωφῖδα* syllaba secunda producta. Ovidius:[u]

Usque sub Orchomenon, Psophidaque, Cyllenenque.

[r p. 1430. ed. Rom.—D.]
[t *εἰς*. ed. Heyn.—D.]
[s p. 135. ed. Heyn. (1803).—D.]
[u *Met.* V. 607.—D.]

Percommode autem hic locus Apollodori in memoriam mihi alium redigit, in libro primo; qui viros doctos in errorem hactenus induxit: deinceps tamen, uti spero, non faciet. *Τυδεὺς δὲ ὥς φησιν ὁ τὴν Ἀλκμαιονίδα γεγραφὼς κτείνας τοὺς Μέλανος παῖδας ἐπιβουλεύοντας Οἰνεῖ, Φηνέα,* &c.[v] Quæ sic Latine expressit interpres: *Is qui Alcmæonidem tragœdiam scripsit.* Hominem sane liberalem, qui vocem illam *tragœdiam* benigne nobis de suo largitus est. Atqui, O bone, *Ἀλκμαίων* ea tragœdia, non *Ἀλκμαιονὶς* inscribitur, ut Erotianus, Stobæus, Priscianus, aliique testantur. Sicuti autem Philoclis tragici tetralogia de Pandione *Πανδιονὶς*, atque Æschyli de Oreste *Ὀρεστεία* nominata est; ita fieri potest ut Euripides tria dramata de Alcmæone publicaverit, una cum quarto satyrico argumenti omnino alieni: quam integram tetralogiam *Ἀλκμαιωνίδα* vocarent. Sed oportet Epicharmi illud semper habeas in promptu,

Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν· ἄρθρα ταῦτα τᾶν φρενῶν.[w]

Quicunque enim humaniores has Musas colit, sæpenumero solet usu venire ut

Ἴσκῃ ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἐτύμοισιν ὅμοια.[x]

Siquidem hæ de *Alcmæonide* suspiciones, ægri sunt somnia; cum is scriptor, quicunque tandem fuerit, (neque enim de ætate, neque de patria viri, aut nomine quicquam habeo compertum) historicus sit, non tragicus.[y] *Ὁ δὲ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γράψας* (verba sunt Strabonis, lib. 10.[z]) *Ἰκαρίου*

[v Apollodori verba sunt hæc: *Τυδεὺς δὲ ἀνὴρ γενόμενος γενναῖος, ἐφυγαδεύθη, κτείνας, ὡς μέν τινες λέγουσιν, ἀδελφὸν Οἰνέως Ἀλκάθοον· ὡς δὲ ὁ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γεγραφὼς, τοὺς Μέλανος, κ. τ. λ.* p. 23. ed. Heyn.—D.]

[w Polyb. xviii. 23. t. iv. p. 88. ed. Schw., ubi . . . *τῶν φρ.*—Suid. in *Νῆφε* et *Πρόχειρος.*—D.]

[x Hom. *Od.* xix. 203., ubi *Ἴσκεν.*—D.]

[y " *Ἀλκμαίων* nomen *tragœdiæ.* *Ἀλκμαίωνις* poema *epicum.*" Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 475., ubi de his vocibus plura.—" *Alcmæonida* carmen epicum fuisse, longe probabilius est: quæ est sententia Heynii ad Apollodorum." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[z p. 660. ed. Falc.—D.]

τοῦ Πηνελόπης πατρὸς υἱοὺς γενέσθαι δύο, Ἀλυζέα καὶ Λευκάδιον· δυναστεῦσαι δ' ἐν[a] *Ἀκαρνανίᾳ τούτους μετὰ τοῦ πατρός.* Et quidem Euripide vetustior. Scholiastes ad *Orestem* v. 1000.[b] *Ἀκολουθεῖν δοκεῖ (ὁ Εὐριπίδης) τῷ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα* (*ω* scribe etiam apud Apollodorum, non *ο*) *πεποιηκότι εἰς τὰ περὶ τὴν ἄρνα, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ κυκλογράφος φησί. Φερεκύδης δὲ οὐ καθ' Ἑρμοῦ μῆνίν φησι τὴν ἄρνα ὑποβληθῆναι. ὁ δὲ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γράψας τὸν ποιμένα προσαγαγόντα τὸ ποιμνίον τῷ Ἀτρεῖ ἀνταποκαλεῖ.* Quid tibi dicam depravatum mihi videri verbum illud postremum? *χροὶ* enim *δῆλον, τὸ τοῦ Φερεκύδου.* leg. *Ἀνταῖον ἀποκαλεῖ* vel *Ἀντανδρον καλεῖ* vel *Ἀντιφον,* vel simile quippiam; cum sine controversia desit nomen pastoris. Hæc habui, Milli jucundissime, quæ de *Alcmæone* et *Alcmæonide* ore, ut opinor, alio indicta dicerem: non enim placet eorum ratio, qui cum meræ corniculæ sint, emendicatis hinc inde plumis germanos pavones se pollicentur.[c]

Pag. 104. Multa narrat Malelas de Prœto, Sthenebœa, et Bellerophonte, *καθὼς συνεγράψατο Εὐριπίδης, ὁ τραγικὸς ποιητὴς, πληρώσας τὸ δρᾶμα.* Intellige de fabula *Sthenebœa,* cujus mentio fit apud Athenæum, Stobæum, alios. Julius

[a Ψν τῇ. ed. Falc.—D.]

[b v. 994. ed. Pors.—*Schol.* t. iv. p. 452. ed. Matt.—D.]

[c "In quorum quidem manus nondum venisset illa R. Bentleii ad Jo. Millium Epistola, cum prodiret Euripides Barnesii, in his fragmentis nonnulla forte laudaverint velut nova, Ἀλκμαίωνα τὸν διὰ Ψωφῖδος· diversa dramata inscripta Κρῆτες et Κρῆσσαι, et alia quædam minime vulgata, Barnesiis certe ante incognita, quam ista, qui solus forte viderat, primus monuisset Bentleius in perdocta Epistola; in qua cum hæc scripserit, p. 20. [ed. Oxon.] *non placere* sibi *eorum rationem, qui, cum meræ corniculæ sint, emendicatis hinc inde plumis germanos pavones se pollicentur;* quanta Bentleii debuit esse indignatio, cum sic a Populari suo, Græcæ tamen linguæ peritissimo, dilaceratas Tragici videret reliquias, quas ipse, juvenis, tam sollicita cura composuisset; nam ex eadem didicimus Epistola, *fragmenta omnium Poetarum Græcorum cum emendationibus et notis grande opus edere* olim Bentleium constituisse. Hoc quale fuisset opus pars ejus exigua demonstrat, quæ publicata prostat, exhibens operum Callimachi perditorum reliquias; qua nihil in hoc genere præstantius prodiit aut magis elaboratum." Valcken., *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 3.—Confer etiam Porson's *Tracts,* &c. (by Kidd), p. 313.—D.]

Pollux lib. 3. cap. 4.[d] *Εἴρηται δὲ ξεναπάτη παρ' Εὐριπίδῃ.* Nomen tragœdiæ non commemorat; aliunde tamen scimus hanc esse de qua agimus, *Sthenebœam.* *Ξεναπάτας*, ait Photius MS. *ἰδίως ἐπὶ τῶν . . . . . ὅταν μὴ τοιοῦτοι πνέωσιν ἄνεμοι ἐν τοῖς πελάγεσιν, ὁποῖοι ἐν τοῖς λιμέσιν. Εὐριπίδης Σθενεβοίᾳ. Τίς ἄνδρα τινὰ ξεναπάταν.*[e] Scribe autem in Polluce *ξεναπάτης*. Apparet ita corrigendum esse, cum ex hoc loco Photii; tum ex Euripidis *Medea*, quæ in extrema fabula sic Jasoni convitium facit, *Τίς δὲ κλύει σου θεὸς ἢ δαίμων, τοῦ ψευδόρκου καὶ ξειναπάτα;*[f] Aristophanes *Vespis*:[g]

Εἴτις ὑμῶν, ὦ θεαταὶ, τὴν ἐμὴν ἰδὼν φύσιν,
Εἶτα θαυμάζει μ' ὁρῶν μέσον διεσφηκωμένον,
Ἥτις ἡμῶν[h] *ἡ 'πίνοια τῆσδε τῆς ἐγκεντρίδος,*
Ῥᾳδίως ἐγὼ διδάξω, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρίν.

Scholiastes annotat ad versum novissimum: *ὁ στίχος ἐκ Σθενεβοίας Εὐριπίδου.* Bene pol factum, quod nos docuerit, unde tralatus sit hic *στίχος*, quod quidem alias nesciremus. Atque ea gratia non leve peccatum ei condonabitur. Enimvero non totus versus, ut ille existimavit, sed pars tantummodo posterior ex Euripide est. Nam in his rebus verba mihi dari haud facile patior, qui, ut scis, fragmenta omnium Poetarum Græcorum cum emendationibus et notis grande opus edere constitueram: nunc, ut aiunt, *Ἄλλος βίος, ἄλλη δίαιτα.* Plutarchus *Συμποσιακῶν* i. 5.[i] *Πῶς εἴρηται τὸ,*

Μουσικὴν δ' ἄρα
Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρίν.

Quem ego locum admiror, cum sine dubio depravatus sit, nemini unquam in suspicionem venisse. Ita exhibent, ut vulgo legitur, Erasmus et Jos. Scaliger in *Proverbiis;* ita Grotius in *Excerptis.* Spes tamen est, ut nunc jam dehinc

[d p. 296. ed. Hemst.—D.]
[e τιμᾶ ξεναπάτην. ed. Pors.—D.]
[f v. 1388. ed. Pors.—D.]
[g v. 1071. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[h Ἥτις ἐστίν. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[i *Mor.* t. iii. p. 353. ed. Wyttenb.—Eurip. *Stheneb.* Frag. iii. ed. Matt.—D.]

tam turpe erratum ex libris et memoria hominum auferatur. Legent enim qui sapient, *μουσικὸν*, non *μουσικὴν*. *Μουσικὸν διδάσκει*, i. e. *ποιητὴν ἀποδείκνυσι*, *poetam reddit:* quasi hoc senario Latine dixeris: *Amor poetam vel facit, vel invenit.*[i] Ars musica et studium musicum est poetica. Terentius:[j] *Is sibi responsum hoc habeat; in medio omnibus Palmam esse positam, qui artem tractant musicam.* Ea autem significatio *τοῦ διδάσκειν* elegantior paulo est et rarior, proptereaque fraudi fuit librariis: attamen non desunt exempla. Aristoph. *Ranis:*

Καὶ σὺ τί δὴ δράσας αὐτοὺς οὕτως ἀνδρείους ἐδίδαξας;

Sed et hic locus in vitio est; et legendum auctore MS. Oxoniensi,

Καὶ σὺ τί δράσας οὕτως αὐτοὺς γενναίους ἐξεδίδαξας;[k]

Vulgata lectio cum propter alia minus placet, tum ob hoc præcipue; quod *τὸ τετραπόδιον* sive IV. priorum pedum mensura non debet in dimidiatum verbum desinere. Idem Plutarchus *Περὶ τοῦ μὴ χρᾷν ἔμμετρα νῦν τὴν Πυθίαν.*[l] *Ὁ δ' Εὐριπίδης*, ait, *εἰπὼν, ὡς διδάσκει ποιητὴν ἔρως, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρὶν, ἐνόησεν ὅτι*, et quæ sequuntur. Nicias Medicus apud Schol. Theocriti *Idyll.* xi.[m]

Ἦν ἄρ' ἀληθὲς τοῦτο, Θεόκριτε, οἱ γὰρ ἐρῶντες
Πολλάκι ποιητὰς ἐδίδαξαν τοὺς πρὶν ἀμούσους.

[i "Observatio Bentleii minime vulgaris manet eadem, sive legatur *μουσικὸν*, seu, quod Euripidem arbitror dedisse:

ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα
Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἂν ἄμουσος ᾖ τὸ πρίν.

Quod Grotius aliique dedere, *μουσικὴν δ' ἄρα*—semel apud Plutarchum, Sympos. I. 5. p. 622. c. alterum legitur apud eumdem bis." [in libello de *Pyth. Or.*, quem infra citat Bentleius, et in *Erot.*—*Mor.* t. iv. p. 37. ed. Wyttenb. &c.] Valcken., *Diatr. in Eurip.* &c. p. 206., ubi plura.—D.]

[j *Prol. in Phorm.* 17.—D.]

[k v. 1017. ed. Bekk., ubi *Καὶ τί σύ.*—D.]

[l *Mor.* t. ii. p. 454. ed. Wyttenb., ubi . . . . *ὡς Ἔρως ποιητὴν διδάσκει*, et *ἐνενόησε.*—D.]

[m *Argum. Idyl.* xi.—*Poet. Min. Gr.* t. ii. p. lx. ed. Gaisf., ubi . . . *οἱ γὰρ Ἔρωτες Πολλοὺς ποιητ. κ. τ. λ.*—D.]

Sed quo me cunque recipio, omnia conspicio mendis et maculis inquinata. Ecce enim et huic medico medicina adhibenda est. Scribendum est, inquam,

———καὶ γὰρ Ἔρωτες
Πολλάκι ποιητὰς ἐδίδαξαν τοὺς πρὶν ἀμούσους.

P. 106. Περὶ δὲ τῆς Πασιφάης ἐξέθετο δρᾶμα Εὐριπίδης ὁ ποιητής. Inanem, mihi crede, operam sumpserit, qui Euripidis *Pasiphaen* instituerit quærere. Non temere dico atque equidem certe scio neminem ex scriptoribus vetustis hodie superesse, qui tale quidquam memoriæ tradiderit. Hesychius tamen, Σαρδὼ, ait, ἐν Πασιφάῃ τὸ σαρδόνιον, ἡ σφραγὶς εἴρηται. quem si ad Euripideam fabulam respexisse quispiam existimet; caveat moneo, et existimationi suæ insidias parari cogitet. Alcæi quidem comœdia *Pasiphae* inscripta est, ut scimus ex Didascalia *Pluti* Aristophanis: Ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀντιπάτρου, ἀνταγωνιζομένου αὐτῷ Νικοχάρους μὲν Λάκωσιν, Ἀριστομένους δὲ Ἀδμήτῳ, Νικοφῶντος δὲ Ἀδώνιδι, Ἀλκαίου δὲ Πασιφάῃ. Sed Euripidis *Pasiphaen* nusquam cuiquam laudari reperies. Quid igitur fiet? Num nam Antiochensis, cum hæc scriberet, memoriola vacillavit γεροντικῶς, an mendacio conatus est fallere? Utrum libet sane fecerit, haud arbitrario vapulabit: atque adeo dudum est, quod homunculum video σκύτη βλέπειν. Verum hercle quanquam admodum nupera est inter nos notitia; me tamen et precatorem habebit et defensorem paratum: cum et alias soleam esse in amicitiis fidelis. Dico igitur Euripidem tragœdiam quidem de Pasiphae publicasse, minime tamen *Pasiphaen* inscripsisse, sed *Cretenses*. Nec tu mihi de Κρήσσαις hoc perperam intelligas, quæ ex Athenæo, Stobæo, et aliunde satis in notitiam venerunt: sed de quibus hodie fortasse primum inaudivisti, Κρησί· quandoquidem et Joannis Meursii, qui de trium tragicorum fabulis accurate studioseque scripsit, diligentiam effugerunt. In Aristophanis *Ranis* his verbis compellat Euripidem Æschylus:

Ὦ Κρητικὰς μὲν συλλέγων μονῳδίας,
Γάμους δ' ἀνοσίους εἰσφέρων εἰς τὴν τέχνην.[n]

Quo in loco hæc annotat Scholiastes: *Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ΚΡΗΣΙΝ Ἴκαρον μονῳδοῦντα ἐποίησε. καὶ οἱ μὲν εἰς τὴν Ἰκάρου μονῳδίαν ἐν τοῖς ΚΡΗΣΙ· θρασύτερον γὰρ δοκεῖ*[o] *τὸ πρόσωπον. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ, ὅτι δύναται καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἀερόπην τὴν ἐν τοῖς Κρήταις εἰρῆσθαι, ἣν εἰσήγαγε πορνεύουσαν. Οἶμαι δὲ διὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ Αἰόλῳ. Τιμαχίδας δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς ΚΡΗΣΙ μίξιν ΠΑΣΙΦΑΗΣ πρὸς τὸν ταῦρον.* Absolvimus, opinor, Joannem ab omni suspicione peccati: nunc et huic Scholiasti patrocinari oportet. Non enim deerunt qui pervulgata via quorundam, qui germanos se putant esse Aristarchos, extemplo pro verbo *Κρησὶ* contendent esse reponendum *Κρήσσαις*. Pedetentim tamen, et aliquantisper, oro, manum abstineant; dum tribunos adeam qui intercedant tantæ temeritati. Ecce iterum Scholiastes ad hæc verba Aristophanis,

Ἀλλ', ὦ Κρῆτες, Ἴδης τέκνα,
Τὰ τόξα λαβόντες ἐπαμύνατε.[p]

Ταῦτα, ait, *παρὰ τὰ ἐκ ΚΡΗΤΩΝ Εὐριπίδου.* Bina profecto sunt dramata *Κρῆτες* et *Κρῆσσαι*, argumento longe dissimili. Personæ omnino aliæ introducuntur, scenæ ponuntur in locis disjunctissimis maximeque diversis. Illic Icarum cernis et Pasiphaen: in *Cressis* Aeropen, Atrea, Thyestem. Hic Argis Peloponnesi, illic in Creta insula res aguntur. Aristophanes *Vespis*:[q]

Τοῦτο δὲ
Ἅδης διακρινεῖ πρότερον ἢ 'γὼ πείσομαι.

Ubi Scholiastes, *Ἐν Κρήσσαις*, ait, *Εὐριπίδου, ὁ Ἀτρεὺς πρὸς τὴν Ἀερόπην * κρινεῖ ταῦτα.* Unde perspicuum est, in superiore loco corrigendum esse *Ἀερόπην τὴν ἐν ταῖς Κρήσ-*

[n v. 848. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[o δοκεῖ εἶναι. Schol. ib.—D.]
[p *Ran.* v. 1352. ed. Bekk., ubi Ἴδας.—D.
[q v. 762. ed. Bekk.—D.]

σαις. Porphyrius lib. 4.[r] *De Abstinentia:* Μικροῦ με παρῆλθε καὶ τὸ Εὐριπίδειον παραθέσθαι, ὃς τοὺς ἐν Κρήτῃ τοῦ Διὸς προφήτας ἀπέχεσθαί φησι διὰ[s] τούτων. λέγουσι δὲ οἱ κατὰ τὸν χορὸν πρὸς τὸν Μίνω·

Φοινικογενοῦς παῖ τῆς Τυρίας
Τέκνον Εὐρώπης καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου
Ζηνὸς,[t] ἀνάσσων
Κρήτης ἑκατομπτολιέθρου·
Ἥκω ζαθέους ναοὺς προλιπὼν,
Οὓς αὐθιγενὴς τμηθεῖσα δρῦς
Στεγανοὺς παρέχει χαλύβῳ πελέκει,
Καὶ ταυροδέτρῳ κραθεῖ-
σ' ἀτρεκοῦς ἁρμοὺς κυπαρίσσου. et quæ sequuntur.

Ita locum hunc emendare conatus est Grotius in *Excerptis ex Comœdiis et Tragœdiis Græcis.*[u] Cujus auctoritatem Cantabrigienses in novissima Porphyrii editione secuti sunt. "Hoc fragmentum Euripidis" (verba sunt Grotii) "ἐν Κλεισὶ extare dicit Erotion, ut quidem nunc legitur. At ex *Cressis* esse facile intelligitur, quod verba sunt chori ad Minoa."[v] Sed erravit in re levi, gravioribus, opinor, studiis intentus, vir supra comparationem atque æmulationem nostram longissime positus. Cum enim in *Cressis,* ut jam docui, Atreus et Aerope loquantur; scena autem sine controversia sit Argos; vix aut nullo modo est, ut hæc Porphyriana ex eodem dramate petita videantur. Quod si sint, demiror equidem cur in Creta Minos cum his sacerdotibus sermonem instituat. Quæ enim hæ præstigiæ? quibusnam machinis hæc ἄνω καὶ κάτω? Eademne in fabula tam alienæ historiæ? duplexne scena, et geminus chorus? Modo Cretam spectemus, modo regiam Atrei? modo chorus virilis, Mystæ, inquam, Idæi Jovis, modo grex fœminarum ad partes

[r p. 172. ed. Cant. 1655.—*Cret.* Frag. ii. ed. Matt.—D.]
[s "Forsan ἀεί." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]
[t Ζανός. ed. Cant. et Grot.—D.]
[u p. 391.—D.]
[v p. 957. ubi . . . "facile intelligitur ex Porphyrio de non edendis animalibus quarto. Ait enim verba esse chori ad Minoa."—D.]

veniat? Inde enim fabula *Κρῆσσαι* nomen accepit, quod in ea chorus sit mulierum Cretensium, videlicet quæ Aeropem e Creta comitatæ sunt. Similem ob causam *Φοίνισσαι*, *Τρωάδες*, *Τραχίνιαι*, aliæ bene multæ suis vocabulis nominantur. Nec tamen, quod chorus sit Cretensium, idcirco necesse est, ut in Creta scena sit posita: quando et in *Phœnissis* res Thebis aguntur, chorum tamen constituunt mulieres Tyriæ: *Τύριον οἶδμα λιποῦσ' ἔβαν Ἀκροθίνια Λοξίᾳ Φοινίσσας ἀπὸ νάσου.*[w] Sed quid tergiversamur? Scimus Aeropen Catrei fuisse filiam, Minois neptem: et quo tempore res hæ transactæ sunt, jam diu liberos suscepisse. Siquidem Agamemnonem et Menelaum patri fuisse conscios commemorant, cum cœnam illam feralem Thyestæ apponeret. Non ergo de Minoe proavo longa dubitatio est, quin e numero vivorum pridem ante excesserit. Imo vero a filiabus Cocali trucidatus est: si Eusebio fides, prius circiter triennio; sed secundum exactissimam rationem Gulielmi Lloidii, Episcopi Asaphensis,

Ἀνδρὸς, ὃν οὔτ' αἰνεῖν τοῖσι κακοῖσι θέμις,[x]

ante annis solidis quatuor et viginti, quam Atreus regnum capesseret. Quamobrem haud facile patior, ut corrupta illa verba Erotiani *Εὐριπίδης ἐν Κλεισὶ* magis magisque a Grotio depraventur: sed, quod ad vulgatam lectionem proxime accedit, auctor esse ausim, ut posthac *ἐν ΚΡΗΣΙ* corrigatur. Ita totum erit simplex et unum, omnia sibi constabunt, belleque convenient: Minos, chorus Mystarum, Pasiphae, Icarus. Non opus erit *κλώθειν τὰ ἀσύγκλωστα.* Restat, ut de loci hujus Porphyriani miris quidem modis mendosi lectione accurate quantum in nobis est, et exquisite disputemus:

Ἥκω ζαθέους ναοὺς προλιπὼν,

[w v. 209. ed. Pors.—D.]

[x *ὅτι πολλὴν εὔνοιαν ἔσχε πρὸς τὸν* Πλάτωνα *ὁ* Ἀριστοτέλης, *δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ καὶ βωμὸν ἀνιερῶσαι τῷ* Πλάτωνι, *ἐν ᾧ ἐπέγραψεν οὕτω·*

Βωμὸν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐνιδρύσατο τόνδε Πλάτωνος,
Ἀνδρὸς, ὃν οὐδ' [vulgo οὔτ'] αἰνεῖν τοῖσι κακοῖσι θέμις.

Ammonius in *Aristotelis Vita*—Arist. *Opp.* t. i. p. 46. ed. Bip., ubi vide Buhlii notam.—D.]

*Οὓς αὐθιγενὴς τμηθεῖσα δρῦς**
Στεγανοὺς παρέχει Χαλύβῳ πελέκει,
Καὶ ταυροδέτρῳ κραθεῖ-†
Σ' ἀτρεκοῦς‡ *ἁρμοὺς κυπαρίσσου.*

Quæ ita vertit Cl. Grotius:

Sacra advenio templa relinquens,
Quas prisca domos dedit indigena
Quercus Chalyba secta bipenni,
Taurique sibi glutine jungens
De vera tigna cupressu.

Haud ita facere debet qui interpretis munere fungitur. Nolim eum in cæteris scriptis eodem modo indiligentem. Unde enim *ἁρμοὶ* sunt *tigna?* quid ista sibi vult *vera* cupressus? Cur spreta est vulgata Porphyrii lectio *ἀτρεκεῖς*? Cur Erotiani auctoritas repudiata, qui locum hunc ideo citavit, ut ostenderet *ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμὰς* non significare *ἀληθεῖς veras*, sed *ἀκριβεῖς, arctas* nempe *et exactas compages*. Ejus verba sunt hæc:[y] *Καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Κλεισί* (leg. *Κρησί*) *φησιν, Ἥκω ζαθέους*, &c. *κολληθεὶς ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμάς· οὐκ εἶπεν ἀληθεῖς ἁρμὰς, ἀλλ' ἀκριβεῖς*. Sic corrigendum esse facile videbit, cui ad manum est Erotianus: vulgo enim perperam, *ἀλλ' ἀτρεκεῖς*. Apagesis autem barbarum illud et solœcum *ταυροδέτρῳ*, quo verbo nullus unquam scriptor est usus, aut per analogiam uti poterit. Quin etiam et versui consultum oportuit. Quis enim, qui non negligenter in his literis versatus est, illud omnino probare possit *Καὶ ταυροδέτρῳ κραθεῖ* . . . ., dimetrum scilicet brachycatalectum, ut proxime ante parœmiacum veniat. Affirmo tibi neminem unum tragicum comicumve in eo loco hoc metrum adhibere; multo etiam minus, quod Erotiani scriptura constituit *Καὶ ταυροδέτῳ κολληθείς*. Quid quod ne in Latinis quidem legitimi

* Erotianus *δοκοὺς*, vetus editio Porphyrii *δορός*.
† Porph. *ταυροδέτῳ κρηθεῖσ'*, Erot. *τορολέτῳ κολληθείς*.
‡ Porph. *ἀτρεκεῖς*, Erot. *ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμάς*.
[y p. 36. ed. Franz.—D.]

sunt numeri? In secundo versu, *Quas prisca domos dedit indigena,* tribrachys est loco anapæsti vel cujuscunque pedis quatuor temporum. Quod vitium commune Grotio est cum Jos. Scaligero, Flor. Christiano, aliisque, opinor, omnibus qui sæculo hoc et superiore vel tragœdias Græcas Latine verterunt, vel ipsi scripserunt novas: quibus solenne est anapæstos suos passim, ubi nulla clausula est neque interpunctum, tribrachi vel trochæo vel cretico terminare; vel etiam vocali, aut litera M finire, versu proximo ab alia vocali vel H incipiente. Scilicet etiam hic ut alibi postremam in versu syllabam communem esse arbitrabantur. Næ isti, si olim stante re Græca vel Romana suas fabulas edidissent, sibilis et κλωγμοῖς e scena explosi fuissent. Non enim Græcis ea licentia permissa,

Nec data Romanis venia est indigna poetis.[z]

Fas erat duntaxat versum illum, qui parœmiacus dicitur, trochæo claudere. Eo usque non aliter continuari debebant anapæsti vel pares anapæsto pedes, ac si unicus esset versus. Quin et Seneca tragicus, ut scias eum de industria temperavisse, semel tantum atque iterum trochæo anapæstos clausit, nec nisi finita sententia: qui scilicet parœmiaci locus esset, nisi is scriptor nescio cur versum illum repudiasset. Veteres tamen Latinos minime aspernatos esse parœmiacum, sed et hic Græcorum vestigiis institisse scire dabitur ex istis reliquiis, iisque, ni fallor, solis. Attius *Phinidis:*

Simul et circum magna sonantibus
Excita saxis sæva sonando
Crepitu clangente cachinnant.

[[z] Hor. in *Arte Poet.* 264., ubi "*Et* data," &c.—" Hanc *συνάφειαν,*" inquit Dawesius, in nostrum, ut solebat, sæviens, " in anapæsticis locum habere primus docuit, non jam, uti ipse ad Hor. Carm. iii. 12. 6. asseverat, Cl. Bentleius, sed Terentianus. Is utique pag. 58." &c. *Miscell. Crit.* p. 57. ed. Kidd. 1827., ubi plura. Dixerat enim Bentleius—"ut primus olim docui in Dissertatione ad Joannem Antiochenum Malelam, et postea multo fusius in scripto Anglico de Epistolis Phalaridis." [vide t. i. p. 190. et sqq.—D.]

Locus est apud Nonium in *Cachinnare*.[a] Sed nemo a me impetrabit, ut verba Attii sana esse concedam. Quorsum enim pertinent *magna sæva*, et *sonantibus sonando?* Peccaturus sum, uti spero, intra veniam, si parum prospere medicinam experior. Ex ipso fabulæ nomine magna suspicio est de Harpyiis verba fieri. Fallor itaque an sic legendum est?

Simul et circum stagna sonantibus
Excita saxis sæva Celæno
Crepitu clangente cachinnat.

Illud *clangente* proprie et apte dictum est de Harpyiis.

Virgilius:

At subitæ horrifico lapsu de montibus adsunt
Harpyiæ, et magnis quatiunt *clangoribus* alas.[b]

Quin et *stagna* bene reposui, approbante ibidem Virgilio:

Obscænas *pelagi* ferro fœdare volucres.[c]

Attius *Telepho:*

Jamjam stupido Thessala somno
Pectora languentque senentque.[d]

Id. *Eurysace:*

Super Oceani stagna alta patris
Terrarum anfracta revisam.[e]

Pacuvius *Niptris:*

—— Operite, abscedite, jamjam
Mittite: nam attrectatu et quassu
Sævum amplificati' dolorem.[f]

Attius *Philocteta:*

Heu quis salsis fluctibu' mandet
Me ex sublimi vertice saxi?

[a cap. vi.—D.]
[b *Æn.* iii. 225.—D.]
[c Æn. iii. 241.—D.]
[d Apud Prisc. lib. x. p. 887. ed. Putsch.—D.]
[e ad Non. Marcel. cap. iii. in v. *Anfractum.*—D.]
[f Cic. *Tuscul.* ii. 20.—D.]

Jamjam absumor: conficit animum
Vis volneris, ulceris æstus.[g]

Idem apud Cic. 2. *Tuscul.*[h] "Unde ignis lucet mortalibus clam divisus? eum doctus Prometheus clepsisse dolo pœnasque Jovi fato expendisse supremo." Qui locus sic ad anapæstos suos est reducendus:

Unde igneis cluet immortalibu'
Clam divis nimi' doctu'* Prometheus
Clepsisse dolo, pœnasque Jovi
Furti expendisse supremo.

Ut ad Porphyrium revertar; illud utique scire cupio, quo auctore vir illustriss. *ταυροδέτρῳ κραθεῖσα* de conglutinatione acceperit. Nam *κραθεῖσα*, nisi omnia me fallunt, est *permixta* et *temperata*, non *conjuncta* et *compacta*: *ταυρόδετρον* autem, ut principio dixi, plane barbarum. Quin et *ταυρόδετος* non alibi reperio; neque vero intelligo, quî commode dici poterit. Ut *ἀλυσίδετος* est *ἀλύσει δεθεὶς*, *κηρόδετος κηρῷ*, et siqua sunt alia: sic et *ταυρόδετος* fuerit *ταύρῳ δεδεμένος*, (*tauro compactus*, non *glutino taurino*). Nam quis obsecro *ταῦρον* usurpavit *ἀντὶ τῆς ταυροκόλλας*? Demiror tamen unde illa in Porphyrii et Erotiani codices irrepserint. Haud sane temere factum id videtur: itaque hæret hæc res; neque prompte expedire possum. Ne tamen *ἀσύμβολος* huc veniam; donec aliquid melius succurrit, censeo ut *ταυροδέτῳ* de medio auferatur: (cum sine eo plena sit sententia, *τῷ κολληθεῖσα ἁρμὰς*, ex Homerico isto, ut videtur, adumbrata;

Κολλητὰς δ' ἐπέθηκα θύρας πυκινῶς ἀραρυίας.[i]

Atque hoc pacto *βάσις* ista *ἀναπαιστικὴ*, versus videlicet qui parœmiacum antecedit, monometrum erit acatalectum;

[g Apud Cic. *Tuscul.* ii. 7., ubi in ver. sec. "*animam.*"—D.]

[h c. 9. Hæc varie tentarunt viri docti: vide Davisium ad loc.; et Hermannum in *Elem. Doct. Met.* p. 246. ed. Glasg.—D.]

* *vel* catu' doctu'.

[i *Od.* xxiii. 194.—D.]

ut profecto plerumque est, et in hoc ipso quidem loco plus semel.) Cætera autem porro sic legantur:

Ἥκω ζαθέους ναοὺς προλιπὼν,
Οἷς αὐθιγενὴς τμηθεῖσα δοκοὺς
Στεγανὰς παρέχει Χαλύβων πελέκει,
Καὶ κολληθεῖσ'
Ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμὰς κυπάρισσος.[i]

Adsum a sanctis templis, validas
Quibus indigena est sueta cupressus
Præbere trabes, cæsa securi
Chalybum, atque arctas
Compages glutine vincta.

Alibi nimis occupatum habuit animum ὁ πάνυ, cum illud δρῦς comminisceretur. Cur enim quercus vocaretur αὐθιγενής? quid? non alibi tam frequens quam in Creta nascebatur? Ego vero, ut primum oculis verbum illud agnovi, continuo deprehendi κυπάρισσος a poeta scriptum esse, non κυπαρίσσου. Eam enim illic memineram esse vere αὐθιγενῆ, et Creticam propterea appellari a Plutarcho:[j] Ἡ Ἰσθμικὴν πίτυν ἢ Κρητικὴν κυπάρισσον· sicut et Idæam a Nicandro:

Σπέρματα βουπλεύρου τε καὶ Ἰδαίης κυπαρίσσου·[k]

et Virgilio:

Nec salici lotoque neque Idæis cyparissis.[l]

Plinius xvi. 33.[m] de cupresso loquens; *Huic*, ait, *patria insula Creta, cum Cato Tarentinam eam appellet, credo quod*

[[i] Postremos tres versus sic exhibuit Matthiæus, Eurip. *Creten.* Frag. ii.;
στεγανοὺς παρέχει Χαλύβῳ πελέκει,
καὶ ταυρόδετός γ'
ἀτρεκεῖς ἁρμοὺς κυπάρισσος.

Confer J. Scaligerum apud Fabr. *Bibl. Gr.* t. vi. p. 237.; Toupium, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 549.; Tyrwhittum, *Not. in Toup.* t. iv. p. 426.; Porsonum, *Not. in Toup.* t. iv. p. 490.; Hermannum apud Lobeckium *De Morte Bacchi*, p. 11.; *Aglaoph.* t. i. p. 622.; Matthiæum ad loc.—D.]

[[j] *Convив. Disp.* lib. i. quæst. 2.—*Mor.* t. iii. p. 341. ed. Wyttenb., ubi τὴν Ἰσθ. πίτ. ἢ τὴν Κρητ. κυπάριττον.—D.]

[[k] *Ther.* 586.—D.]

[[l] *Geor.* ii. 84.—D.]

[[m] t. ii. p. 24. ed. Hard. 1723.—D.]

primum eo venerit: et in Ænaria succisa regerminat. Simili sane tralatione, quam Euripides Cretæ *indigenam* vocat, ei *patriam* esse Cretam Plinius commemorat. Sed in ejus verbis macula inest fœdissima, quanquam haud valde δυσέκπλυτος. Quippe pro *Ēaria* non magna mutatione legendum est *Tarra.*[m] Siquidem interpretatur hæc Theophrasti lib. 2. *Hist.* cap. 2.[n] *Κυπάριττος δὲ παρὰ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπὸ σπέρματος, ἐν Κρήτῃ δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ στελέχους, οἷον καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κουρᾶς ἐν Τάῤῥᾳ· παρὰ τούτοις γάρ ἐστιν ἡ κουριζομένη κυπάριττος.* Mihi quidem hoc certius est, quam illa quæ apud Sagram. Sed quia difficulter hoc nonnullis atque ægre persuaderi video, agedum ex Solino *πειθανάγκην* admoveamus *θετταλικὴν*, ut contra siquis sentiat, nihil sentiat. Ejus verba sunt cap. xvii.[o] *Mira soli* (*Cretici*) *indulgentia: arborarii proventus abundantes: nam in hujus tantum insulæ parte repullulant cæsæ cupressi.* Profecto aut *Tarra* in Plinio suo legit Solinus, aut Ænariam arbitratus est partem esse Cretæ. Quamne antea cap. vii. in insulis Italicis numeravit? Oris esse ferrei oportet, qui hoc dixerit. Quis autem credat cupressos in Ænaria sponte nasci? Ecquisnam isthuc memoriæ prodidit? non magis mehercule quam Batti silphion aut auriferas malos Hesperidum. Verum ut ulterius progrediamur, etiam Solinum non ab omni parte sanum esse existimo. Valde enim suspicor ita scriptum esse antiquitus: *Nam in Tarra hujus insulæ parte repullulant:* vel, *in hujus tantum insulæ Tarra repullulant.* Nec enim a vulgata lectione longe nimis abscedo: nec probabilem causam reperire possum, cur abstineret eam *partem insulæ* suo vocabulo nominare. Dicerem etiam, si animus esset hariolari conjectura, similitudinem verborum Catoni imposuisse, cum cupressum Tarentinam appellaret. Siquidem urbs Cretæ *Τάῤῥα*, Tarentum autem *Τάρας* vocatur. Lanam quidem, et purpuram, mel, salem, oleam, ceram, porrum,

[m Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard. *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 550.; et Harduinum ad Plin. t. ii. p. 44. ed. 1723.—D.]

[n Theoph. *Opp.* t. i. p. 46. ed. Schneid., ubi . . . *ἀπὸ τοῦ στελέχους, οἷον τὸ τῆς ὀρείας ἐν Τάῤῥᾳ.*—D.]

[o xi. p. 22. ed. Salm.—D.]

pectunculos, ostreas, nucem, castaneas, ficus Tarentinas animadverti fuisse in pretio: cupressum Tarentinam cedo mihi unum, qui supra cæteras laudaverit, præter Catonem. Verum hoc obiter, et magis joco dictum existima, quam quod in ea sim sententia. Jam quod Euripides istam arborem dicit firmissimas trabes templis præbuisse; firmat id adeo emendationem nostram: cum cupressum omnes uno ore testentur *χρονιωτάτην* esse atque *ἀσαπεστάτην*· et quod caput est, egregie præter cæteras in Deorum ædibus locum et honorem invenisse. Hermippus apud Athenæum:[p]

———*ἐκ δ' Αἰγύπτου τὰ κρεμαστὰ*
Ἱστία καὶ βύβλους, ἀπὸ δ' αὖ Συρίας λιβανωτόν.
Ἡ δὲ καλὴ Κρήτη κυπάρισσον τοῖσι θεοῖσι.

Theophrastus *Hist.* v. et 5. *τούτων δὲ χρονιώτατα δοκεῖ τὰ κυπαρίττινα εἶναι. τὸ γοῦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐξ ὧν αἱ θύραι τοῦ νεὼ τεθησαυρισμέναι, τέσσαρας ἔκειντο γενεάς. μόνα δὲ καὶ στιλβηδόνα δέχεται.* Fallor, an oratio hæc *σολοικίζει*? Quo enim illud *τὸ* referri possit? lego: *τὰ γοῦν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐξ ὧν αἱ θύραι τοῦ νεὼ, τεθησαυρισμένα τέσσαρας ἔκειτο γενεάς.*[q] Dicit materiem istam cupressinam per 4. sæcula sive cccc. annos, ex quo primum cæsa est, reconditam fuisse; priusquam ad valvas Ephesini templi adhiberetur: et tamen incorruptam duravisse. Ea Theophrasti sententia est. Profecto nihil hac emendatione certius et evidentius. Ausim equidem dejerare non aliter legisse Plinium, siquidem ad hæc Theophrastea respexit, cum Ephesiæ dicat Dianæ templum *tota Asia exstruente quadringentis annis peractum esse;* et, *valvas esse e cupresso, et jam quadringentis prope annis durare materiem omnem novæ similem.*[r] Scilicet tunc fere materia cædi solet, cum ædificii fundamenta jaciuntur: valvæ autem tum demum fieri, cum cætera omnia perfecta sunt atque absoluta. Hac

[p Ep. lib. i. c. xlix. t. i. p. 104. ed. Schw., ubi in v. 3. *κυπάριττον.*—D.]

[q Sic et Schneiderus, nisi quod *τοῦ νεωστὶ νεὼ* et *τέτταρας* dedit. Theoph. *Opp.* t. i. p. 184.—Ed. Cant. *Epist. ad Mill.*, typographi errore... *τεθησαυρισμέναι τέσσ. ἔκειντο γεν.*—D.]

[r xvi. 40. t. ii. p. 36. ed. Hard. 1723.—D.]

quidem argumentatione Plinius videtur usus: rectene an perperam, nulla mihi quæstio est in præsentia. Illud adeo admiror, eruditis viris, qui tantopere locum hunc exagitaverunt, nihil hujus omnino suboluisse. Sed *εἷς ἀνὴρ οὐ πάνθ' ὁρᾷ*. Porro etiam nostra ætate, ut referunt qui ea loca viserunt, tanta cupressorum vis est in Creta; ut domorum omnium trabes contignationesque atque adeo navigia ex ea materie construantur.

Pag. 109. *Περὶ ἧς (Φαίδρας) ὁ σοφώτατος Εὐριπίδης μετὰ ταῦτα συνεγράψατο δρᾶμα ποιητικῶς*. Sine controversia respexit Malelas ad Euripidis *Hippolytum*: prioremne an posteriorem nec possumus resciscere, nec sane multum refert. Scimus utrumque salvum extitisse per diversa tempora Erotiani, Pollucis, et Stobæi. Quæ Stobæus ex *Hippolyto* citat, eorum ne dimidiam quidem partem hodie invenias. Frustra itidem quæras, quæ Erotianus affert et Pollux. Aristophanes *Ranis*:[q]

Τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστι κατθανεῖν,
Τὸ πνεῖν δὲ δειπνεῖν, καὶ τὸ[r] *καθεύδειν κώδιον.*

Ταῦτα,[s] ait Scholiastes, *ἐξ Ἱππολύτου δράματος*. Age quærat hoc, qui velit in investigando operam perdere. Verum aut librarii peccatum est, aut auctoris *ἁμάρτημα μνημονικόν*. Aliunde[t] enim cognoscimus tralata esse *ἐκ Πολυίδου δράματος*.

Τίς[u] *δ' οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστι κατθανεῖν,*
Τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν.[v]

Hippolytus secundus qui hodie superest, *Στεφανίας* sive *Στεφανηφόρος* inscribitur: prior *Καλυπτόμενος*. Pollux ix. c. v.[w] *Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἱππολύτῳ καλυπτομένῳ· . . . . . πρὸς ἵππων εὐθὺς ὁρμήσας στάσιν*. Nec tamen omnino diversæ erant fabulæ, sicut *Iphigenia in Aulide* et *in Tauris*, *Œdipus*

[q v. 1473. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[r τὸ δέ. ibid.—D.]
[s τοῦτο. Schol.—D.]
[t Schol. in Eurip. *Hippol.* v. 190., t. v. p. 432. ed. Matt.—D.]
[u Τί. eds. *Epist. ad Mill.*, operarum, credo, errore.—D.]
[v Eurip. *Polyidi* Frag. vii. ed. Matt.—D.]
[w p. 1014. ed. Hemst.—D.]

Tyrannus et *in Colono, Prometheus* Δεσμώτης et Λυόμενος. Vix, imo ne vix quidem hoc fieri potest, cum drama posterius rem omnem, uti gesta est, complectatur; ab eo tempore quo primum θεήλατον privigni amorem Phædra conceperat, usque ad Hippolyti mortem: quædam etiam ex priore citentur, quæ et in altero reperias. Quin mihi persuasissimum est eam ob causam Καλυπτόμενον esse inscriptum;[w] quod in extrema fabula sic loquatur Hippolytus moribundus:

[w "Quantumvis autem Bentleius, cui hac in parte præiverat Gul. Canterus, sibi *persuasissimum* esse scribat, priorem Hippolytum eam ob causam Καλυπτόμενον esse inscriptum; mihi tamen, pace viri his in litteris Maximi, neque ea ratio satisfacit, neque etiam causa adparet, ob quam τὸν πρότερον Ἱππόλυτον omnino censeremus inscriptum fuisse Καλυπτόμενον. Nam nihil primum inest isti versui (1458. Κρύψον δέ μου πρόσωπον, ὡς τάχος, πέπλοις) cur illinc petitum nomen inderent dramati; quum morem designet usitatissimum, Tragicis sæpe commemoratum, quo cadavera tegebantur veste injecta, facies præsertim deformata velabatur. Deinde si in utraque edit. Hippolyti, quod statuisse videtur Bentleius, isti fuerint versus reperti, quæ tandem erat causa, cur ob istos versus diversis utraque editio nominibus insigniretur? Tandem nusquam apud Stobæum, nusquam alibi mentio fit Ἱππολύτου καλυπτομένου, nisi in unico loco Pollucis, qui, verba quædam exhibens ex editione priori, cujus laudem editio posterior, et emendata, Atticisque judicibus probata, prorsus obscurasset, propterea, mea quidem sententia, dixerit Ἱππόλυτον καλυπτόμενον. De Menandro Comico Quinctilianus (Instit. Orat. x. c. i. p. 899.) 'omnibus, inquit, ejusdem operis auctoribus abstulit nomen, et fulgore quodam suæ claritatis tenebras obduxit:' Græce diceretur πάντας ἀπέκρυψε, vel ἐκάλυψε· quorum hoc rarius, illud frequenter in istum sensum teritur. Alia quædam ejusdem Quinctiliani (ibid. p. 897.) hic adscribam, valde adposita: 'Correctas (Æschyli) fabulas in certamen deferre posterioribus Poetis Athenienses permisere, suntque eo modo multi coronati.' Retractatum Hippolytum cum in certamen detulisset (Olymp. lxxxvii. anno 4.) superatis Iophonte et Ione, victor renunciatus fuit Euripides et coronatus: hoc vetus adnotatio testatur Hippolyto præfixa (Ἐδιδάχθη ἐπὶ Ἀμείνονος ἄρχοντος, Ὀλυμπιάδι πζ', ἔτει τετάρτῳ, πρῶτος Εὐριπίδης, δεύτερος Ἰοφῶν, τρίτος Ἴων). Hæc si non sola, præcipua certe fuisse ratio videtur, propter quam posterior Hippolytus a Grammaticis Στεφανίας inscriberetur et Στεφανηφόρος. et hujus quidem adpellationis quæ mihi, eadem ratio fuisse videtur Brumœo (Dans son Théâtre des Grecs, t. ii. p. 135). Nec prodit in scenam Hippolytus coronatus (v. 73.), sed manu gestans ex floribus contextam coronam, quam imponeret Dianæ simulacro, quod egregie Musgravius animadvertit. Dici tamen etiam potuit ob pudicitiam admirabilem ipse Hippolytus, ut corona dignus, sic ab Atticis fuisse judicibus coronatus; quo fortasse respiciens Apollonius Philostrati (De Vita Apollon. Tyan. l. vi. c. iii. p. 232.) de Timasione, Ψηφισώμεθα, ἔφη, ἐστεφανῶσθαι (στεφανοῦσθαι) αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ πρὸ Ἱππολύτου τοῦ Θησέως· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐς τὴν Ἀφροδίτην

Κεκαρτέρηται τἄμ'· ὅλωλα γὰρ, πάτερ·
Κρύψον δέ μου πρόσωπον, ὡς τάχος, πέπλοις.[x]

Proinde in utraque fabula comperiebantur hi versiculi. Similiter et alteri *Στεφανηφόρου* nomen est inditum, propter hæc verba Hippolyti non longe a principio:

Σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
Λειμῶνος, ὦ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω.[y]

Non igitur *δρᾶμα* novum erat *Hippolytus Στεφανίας*, sed correctum duntaxat, atque interpolatum, *διασκευὴ τοῦ προτέρου*. Vetus Grammaticus Argumento *Hippolyti*. *Ἔστι δὲ οὗτος ὁ Ἱππόλυτος δεύτερος καὶ Στεφανίας προσαγορευόμενος· ἐμφαίνεται δὲ ὕστερος γεγραμμένος· τὸ γὰρ ἀπρεπὲς καὶ κατηγορίας ἄξιον ἐν τούτῳ διώρθωται τῷ δράματι.* Qui nescit quid sit *διασκευὴ* et *διεσκευασμένον δρᾶμα*, consulere poterit Casaubonum ad Athenæum: ejus ego scrinia non compilo; sed Hesychii locum emendatum curabo, quem nec ille nec alius quisquam intellexisse videtur. *Λυδίζων, χορεύων διὰ τοὺς Λυδοὺς, οἳ σώζονται μὲν, διεσκευ-*

ὕβρισε. Veneri contra quotidie sacra faciens Timasion, cetera pudicus instar Hippolyti, frustra quoque fuerat a noverca sollicitatus. Timasionis, novercæ quoque calumniis petiti, historiam attigit, similesque collegit Muretus (Var. Lection. l. i. c. xii.) quibus plures adjungi possent." Valcken., *Præf. in Eurip. Hippol.* p. xix.

" Schol. [ad Theocr. Id. ii. v. 10.] . . . . . Libri Vaticani, *ἐν τῷ κατακαλυπτομένῳ Ἱπολύτῳ*. Recte. Ejus fabulæ meminit Pollux, ix. 50. De ea agit Cl. Bentleius in *Epist. ad Millium*, et doctissimus Valckenarius ad *Euripidis Hippolytum*. Sed veram *tituli* rationem neuter adsecutus est. Ut *Ἱππόλυτος στεφανηφόρος caput redimitus*, sic *Ἱππόλυτος κατακαλυπτόμενος caput obvolutus*. Sed de Hippolyto *pudore suffuso* haud absimile est. Idem autem *Κατακαλυπτόμενος* et *Ἐγκαλυπτόμενος*. Quo titulo fabulam suam insignivit Anthippus, cus apud Athenæum, lib. ix. p. 403. Hæc est mea de hoc loco sententia. liis placebat. Sed nostra verior et ad rem ipsam adcommodatior." *Curæ Post. in Theocr.* p. 7.

καλυπτόμενος quid significet non satis convenit inter eruditos. Mih videtur, Hippolytum, postquam raptu equorum laceratus esset postea in scenam delatum esse, ut in superstite tragœdia, se *καλυπτόμενον*." Musgravius ad *Hippol.* Καλυπτ. frag. — Confe *Hippol.* Argum.—D.]

Monk.—D.] [y v. 72. ed. Monk.—D.]

ασμένοι δ' εἰσίν.[y] Ita lege locum, cujus hæc est sententia: Magnes veteris comœdiæ scriptor drama docuit *Λυδοὺς*, qui tunc superfuerunt, quo tempore Grammaticus qui primus hæc dixit in vivis fuit; sed sub incudem revocati, novaque lima perpoliti. Photius Patriarcha: *Λυδιάζων, Λυδοὶ Μάγνητος τοῦ κωμικοῦ διεσκευάσθησαν*: lege ut apud Hesychium, *Λυδίζων*. Castigandus etiam Suidas, qui *Λυδιάζων* habet absque interpretatione.[z] Idem Hesychius: *Ψηνίζων, τοὺς ψῆνας λέγει τοὺς τοῦ μάγνητος*: scribe *τοὺς Ψῆνας τοῦ Μάγνητος*. Siquidem ille etiam fabulam *Ψῆνας* publicavit. Aristophanes *Equitibus*:[a]

Ταῦτα μὲν εἰδὼς ἃ 'παθε Μάγνης ἅμα ταῖς πολιαῖς κατιούσαις,
Ὃς πλεῖστα χορῶν τῶν ἀντιπάλων νίκης ἔστησε τρόπαια,
Πάσας δ' ὑμῖν φωνὰς ἱεὶς, καὶ ψάλλων καὶ πτερυγίζων,
Καὶ λυδίζων καὶ ψηνίζων καὶ βαπτόμενος βατραχείοις.

His verbis Magnetis fabulæ *Βαρβιτίδες* sive *Βαρβιτισταὶ*, *Ὄρνιθες*, *Λυδοὶ*, *Ψῆνες*, et *Βάτραχοι* indicantur. Cogita autem, quî pax inter Hesychium Photiumque et Anonymum *περὶ κωμῳδίας* conciliari possit: hic enim omnia Magnetis scripta deperiisse dicit, *οὐδὲν σώζεσθαι. Μάγνης Ἀθηναῖος ἀγωνισάμενος Ἀθήνῃσι νίκας ἔσχεν ια'. τῶν δὲ δραμάτων αὐτοῦ οὐδὲν σώζεται· τὰ δὲ ἐπιφερόμενά ἐστιν ἐννέα.*[b]

Non nostrum inter eos tantas componere lites.[c]

Pag. 148. *Ὁ γὰρ σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης δρᾶμα ἐξέθετο περὶ τοῦ Κύκλωπος, ὅτι τρεῖς εἶχεν ὀφθαλμοὺς, σημαίνων τοὺς τρεῖς ἀδελφοὺς*, et quæ deinceps sequuntur. Os hominis! Hoccine ut Euripides vel in somniis dixerit? Bene factum, quod etiam nunc *Cyclops* supersit. Quod si ita rem, prout narrat Joannes, se habere comperias; non recuso quin, quod

[y Vulgo *Λυδίζων, χωρεύων, διὰ τοὺς, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]
[z Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 548.—D.]
[a v. 518. ed. Bekk., ubi *Τοῦτο μὲν εἰδὼς ἃ παθε, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]
[b *Proleg. ad Aristoph.* p. vii. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[c Virg. *Ecl.* iii. 108., ubi ". . . . inter *vos*."—D.]

gravissimæ pœnæ loco fore putes, per omne vitæ tempus noctes diesque versandi mihi sint et ediscendi adeo Annales hi Volusiani,[c] Malelani volui dicere.

Pag. 210. *Ὡς ὁ σοφὸς Εὐριπίδης δρᾶμα περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Μελεάγρου ἐξέθετο.* *Meleagri* fabulæ mentionem faciunt Macrobius, Stobæus, Scholiastes Pindari, cum aliis. Latine convertit Attius. Hesychius: *Καθωσίωσε, κατέλυσε, κατεύθυσεν. Ἐυριπίδης Μελεάγρῳ.* Lego, *Καθωσίωσε, κατέθυσε.* Vox altera non aliter quam litura sananda est.[d] Nempe primo mendose scriptum est *κατέλυσε·* postea librarius aliquis paulo doctior vel lector quispiam studiosus, in libri margine vel medio fortassis inter versiculos spatio veram emendationem dederat *κατέθυσε.* Tandem evenit, ut utrumque vocabulum conjuncte in versu contexteque scriberetur. Hac sane ratione cum in aliis scriptoribus, tum in lexicographis præcipue non raro peccatum est. Quæ quidem peccata cum haud cujusvis sit odorari; profecto opus est, ut exemplis aliquot confirmemus sententiam nostram, ne temere quidquam et inconsulte loco movisse videamur. *Ἔζελεν, ἔβαλεν, ἔλαβεν.* Ejiciendum est verbum posterius: *ζέλλειν* enim eidem Hesychio est *βάλλειν.* *Εὐηρότατον, εὔδιον, καλὴ γῆ, εὐήροτον, εὔγειον.* Postrema ista ab emendatore quodam profecta sunt; qui prima vitiosa non inepte quidem correxerat. Totus itaque locus sic constituendus est: *Εὐήροτον, εὔγειον, καλὴ γῆ.*[e] † *Φυρτοῖσιν, εἰκαίοις, συμπεφυραμένοις. οἱ δὲ ἄλφιτα οἴνῳ δεδευμένα συμπεφυρμένοις.* Tam scio verbum ultimum a correctore quodam esse, quam me vivere. Nulla dubitatio est, quin ita scripserit Hesychius: *Φυρτοῖσιν, εἰκαίοις, συμπεφυρμένοις. οἱ δὲ ἄλφιτα οἴνῳ δεδευμένα.* † *Ἄντιδι. ἄν τινι ἐνέγμεθα, ἐναντιώμεθα.* Cum vocabulum hoc veniat pone *Ἀντιμισθωτὸς*, scire licet ex literarum serie sic auctorem scripsisse: *Ἀντι-*

[c Vide Catull. Carm. xxxvi. ed Doer.—D.]

[d Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 548. Nil mutandum censet Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 467, 531.—D.]

[e Confer nostrum in Addendis, et in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 548.—D.]

νιενέγμεθα, ἐναντιώμεθα. Postea quidam, qui deprehendit erratum, supra emendavit ad hoc exemplum, scriptionis

ἀντιδι

compendium faciens: *ἀντινιενέγμεθα.* Scimus omnes ita fieri solere. Tandem autem ineptus quispiam librarius eam utriusque vocis continuationem fecit, quam hodie videmus.[f] *Ἐκλύτρισον, ἐκλύρισον, κάλυψον.* Illud *ἐκλύρισον* ex eadem est officina correctorum. Scripsit Hesychius *Ἐκλύτρισον, κάλυψον·* ut ipse literarum ordo testimonio est.[g] Media enim incedunt inter *Ἔκλυτος* et *Ἐκλωπίζει.* Hoc non intelligens pusillus quidam criticus (quî enim id intellexerit, quod ne fando quidem unquam auditum est?) emendare conatus est *ἐκλύρισον,* a verbo *λυρίζω*: *ὄνος* mehercule *πρὸς λύραν.* Tantum enim *τὸ ἐκλυρίζειν* et *τὸ καλύπτειν* significatione differunt,

Quantum Hypanis Veneto distat ab Eridano.[h]

Alte profecto latet ulcus tetrum et *κακοηθέστατον·* quod nisi lancinata prius Hesychii existimatione, negat ad sanitatem perduci posse. Siquidem erubescendo prorsus errore posuit *Ἐκλύτρισον* pro *Ἐλύτρωσον·* quod rectissime quidem interpreteris *κάλυψον.* Ipse Hesychius: *Ἐλύτροις,*[i] *ΚΑΛΥΜΜΑΣΙ, σκεπάσμασιν. Ἔλυτρα, κυρίως τὰ ἐνειλήματα ἢ ΚΑΛΥΜΜΑΤΑ. Ἔλυτρον, δέρμα, θήκη, λέπυρον, ἐνείλημα, ΚΑΛΥΜΜΑ, σκέπασμα.* Inde *ἐλυτρῶσθαι* apud Hippocratem, et *προσελυτροῦν* apud Athenæum, *involucro tegere:* similiter *ἐξελυτρῶσαι, nudare, ex integumentis solvere.* Hesych. *Ἐξελύτρωσας, ἐγύμνωσας.* Satin' hoc certum et exploratum est, *ὦ φίλη κεφάλη,* Milli jucundissime? At enimvero exclamet hic aliquis, O juvenem confidentem et temerarium! tune illum Hesychium, doctissimum gram-

[f Confer nostrum in Addendis, et in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 549.: vide etiam omnino Schowium *ad Hesych. Suppl.* p. 102.—*Ἀντιηνέγμεθα, διηνέγμεθα, ἐναντιώμεθα.* Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 558.—D.]

[g *Ἐκλύτρωσον, ἐκκάλυψον.* Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 431.—D.]

[h Propert. i. 12. 4., ubi vulgo . . . "*dissidet* Eridano."—"Pro *dissidet* in Voss. quarto *distat ab E.*, quæ alterius verbi glossa est." Burm. ad loc.—D.]

[i Vulgo *Ἐνλύστροις.*—D.]

maticorum Hesychium tantæ inscitiæ affinem esse suspicari ausis, ut *Ἐκλύτρισον* scriberet; nisi verbum illud alicubi legisset, apud auctores forte quos longa dies et nimia vetustas subtraxerunt notitiæ nostræ? I jam et frontem nega de rebus periisse. Placide tamen amabo, O quisquis es: et reprime te tantisper, dum alia nonnulla profero, quæ te quoque ipsum velis nolis in sententiam nostram cogent transire. Dum enim ex antiquis Scholiastis, Grammaticis, Lexicis, quæ non contexebantur *κατὰ στοιχεῖον*, omni ex parte vocabula corradit, quibus hanc suam *Συναγωγὴν* locupletet et referciat; sæpe usu venit ut ab imperitis librariis, qui parum accurate scripserant, vel a sui similibus *ὀνοματοθήραις* in errorem inductus sit; quæque nusquam gentium vel lecta vel audita sunt, lectoribus suis obtrudat. Illud sis vide. † *Δελεδώνη, ὁ μυλαῖος ἰχθύς.* Suo loco hoc leges in litera *Δ*. Ego vero nugas has esse meras tibi denuncio: scriptum enim oportuit *Ἐλεδώνη, ὀσμύλος ἰχθύς.* Piscis est de polypodum genere; quem memorant Aristoteles, Athenæus, alii. Idem Hesychius: *Ὀσμύλια, τῶν πολυπόδων αἱ ὄζαιναι λεγόμεναι, καὶ ἰχθύδια ποιὰ ἄπτα εὐτελῆ.*[k] *Ὀσμύλαι, βολβιτῖναι θαλάσσιοι.*[l] Sic emendandi sunt hi loci. Videor autem mihi videre, quid errationis ansam Hesychio dederit. Nimirum in auctore suo scriptum erat *ἡ δ' ἐλεδώνη* vel *μιαρὰ δ' ἐλεδώνη*, vel simile quippiam: ille miser, cum sua ætate libri carerent signis accentus, *δελεδώνην* piscem effinxit, qualem neque Nereus, neque Neptunus, nec ipse pater Oceanus agnoverit. Ecce aliud huic geminum et germanum. † *Θολκάζει, χαλιναγωγεῖ.* Nemo, ut opinor, inficias iverit, quin ita scriptum fuerit, absque tamen notis accentus: *Ἵππους θ' ὁλκάζει*, vel *Νῆάς θ' ὁλκάζει.* Ipse Hesychius: *Ὁλκάζει, ἕλκει, χαλιναγωγεῖ.* Illud autem *θολκάζει* cedo quenquam mortalium qui legerit. † *Ἐνδεκάτευσα, τήνδε κώπην ἐπαρξάμην.* Recta serie hoc scriptum offendes, ut et alia quæ deinceps a me proferentur:

[l Vide Pers. *Sat.* V. 103.—D.]
[k Vulgo *Ὀσμ. τ. π. αἱ ὀξέναι . . . . ἀλλ' εὐτ.*—D.]
[l Vulgo *Ὀσμύναι, βολβητῖναι θαλ.*—D.]

quod certo indicio est non a librario, sed ab Hesychio ipso peccatum esse. Atqui ad hunc modum edidisse debuit: *Ἐδεκάτευσα, τὴν δεκάτην ἐπραξάμην.* † *Διατεύονται, μερίζονται.* et *Διατεύοντο, ἐμερίζοντο.* Ea similitudo est *δ* et *δι* in libris calamo notatis, ut haud facile sit dignoscere. Inde est quod mendosa ea posuerit pro *Δατέονται* et *Δατέοντο,* quæ legas apud Homerum.[m] † *Σικυλλιᾷν, τὸ τοὺς κροσσοὺς ἀποσείεσθαι.* Verbum hoc reperies inter *Σίβολε* et *Σιβύνη.* Ipse literarum ordo satis argumento est ab Hesychio positum esse *Σιβυλλιᾷν.* idque errore manifesto pro *Σιλλυβιᾷν.* Hesychius: *Σίλλυβα,*[n] *κροσσοί. οἱ δὲ τὰ ἀνθέμια καὶ κοροκόσμια.* Pollux vii. c. xiv.:[o] *Τοὺς δὲ θυσάνους καὶ σίλλυβα οἱ παλαιοὶ καλοῦσι ποιηταί.* Sic locus iste legendus est ex codice MS. qui fuit Is. Vossii. *Θύσανοι* autem cum Polluci tum Hesychio sunt *κροσσοί.* † *Ἐρεθέντα, ἐν ὕδατι ἀποπνιγέντα. Ἐραθέντι, ληφθέντι.* Portentosi errores. Primo, oportuit scriptum *Ἐρχθέντα.* Ipse enim alibi: *Ἐρχθέντα, ἐν ὕδατι πνιγέντα.* Ita Photius Patriarcha in Lexico MS. Ita Suidas. Locus est in *Φ. Iliadis*:[p]

Νῦν δέ με λευγαλέῳ πότμῳ εἵμαρτο ἁλῶναι,
Ἐρχθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ ποταμῷ, ὡς παῖδα συφορβὸν,
Ὃν ῥά τ' ἔναυλος ἀποέρσει χειμῶνι περῶντα.

Iterum, illud *Ἐραθέντι* librarii peccatum est pro *Ἐρεθέντι.* Constat hoc ex elementorum ordine. Qui quidem est error auctoris, pro *Αἰρεθέντι. Αι* et *Ε* apud Græcos non differunt pronunciatione; de qua re postea plura dicemus. Ecce alia monstra: † *Ἐπαλογῆς, σπουδῆς, ἀνταποδόσεως.* Quam turpiter autem hic se dedit! adeo quidem ut hominis me pudeat pigeatque. Siquidem *Ἀνταποδόσεως* est *ἐπαλλαγῆς,* et *Σπουδῆς* est *ἐπειγωλῆς*· putidum autem suum *ἐπαλογῆς* *Ipse habeat secum servetque sepulchro.*[q] † *Ἀχινάων, τῶν*

[m *Il.* xviii. 264., xx. 394.—D.]
[n Vulgo *Σίλλυμα.*—D.]
[o p. 733. ed. Hemst.—D.]
[p v. 281., ubi . . . . *λευγαλέῳ θανάτῳ.*—D.]
[q Virg. *Æn.* iv. 29., ubi . . . . " *ille* habeat," &c.—D.]

ἀχιδάων. Hercules, tuam fidem! enimvero non ab omnibus portentis Græciam liberasti. Erat hominis eruditi sic edidisse: Ἐχινάων, τῶν Ἐχινάδων. Verbi sedes in Homeri Bœotia est;

Οἳ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίοιο, Ἐχινάων θ' ἱεράων.[r]

† Ἠθέσει, ἀνθεῖ, ἀγνοεῖ, παρορᾷ. Adeste huc conjectores et interpretes portentorum. Negant usquam quidquam monstrosius vidisse. Scilicet hæc vera scriptura est, Ἀηθέσσει, ἀηθεῖ. *Etymologicon Magnum*: Ἀηθέσσειν, ἀγνοεῖν, ἀπείρως ἔχειν. Ἀηθεῖν, λανθάνειν, ἀνεπιστημονεῖν. Hesychius ipse: Ἀήθειν, μὴ ἠθεῖσθαι, μὴ νοεῖν. lege ἀηθεῖν, μὴ εἰθίσθαι. Ἀήθεσκον, (lege ἀήθεσσον) ἀσυνήθεις ἦσαν. † Ἐλεντὺν, ἔλαιον. Mira vero Grammatici eruditio. Poteras haud paulo melius, Ἐλεητὺν, ἔλεον; siquidem Homerici illius meminisses:

Οὐκ ὄπιδα φρονέοντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶν οὐδ' ἐλεητύν.[s]

† Ἀτρεμῆ, ὑγεία. Pace quod tua dicatur, Hesychi, in his verbis οὐδὲν ὑγιές. Imposuit tibi depravatus aliquis codex: oportuit enim Ἀρτεμῆ, ὑγιᾶ. Te ipsum arbitrum capio, qui hæc alibi: Ἀρτεμῆ, σῶον, ὑγιᾶ, σώφρονα. Ἀρτεμέα, ὑγεία, (lege ὑγιᾶ) ὑγιῆ. Ἀρτελὲς, (corrige Ἀρτεμὲς) ὑγιές. Necdum peccandi finis: ecce enim de integro: † Ἀρτηνεστέραν, ὑγιεστέραν, ἐντιμοτέραν. Duplex erratum est, hoc librarii, illud auctoris. Apparet enim cum ex ordine, tum ex interpretatione, non aliter scripsisse Hesychium quam Ἀρτιμεστέραν· nempe vel scripturæ mendum, vel minutæ fugientesve literæ, vel nimia festinatio in causa fuit, cur illud exhiberet pro Ἀρτεμεστέραν. Cum autem Ἀρτιμεστέραν non multum absimile sit τῷ Τιμηεστέραν· ille secundam interpretationem liberalissime donavit de suo; prout error errorem generare solet. † Ἀτισιλινοῖς, περὶ τὰ λινὰ ἐξαμμάτων

[r *Il.* ii. 625.—Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 549.—D.]

[s *Odyss.* xiv. 82.—D.]

δέσεσιν. Dic sodes, annon ænigma tibi videntur hæc? Equidem non sum Œdipus: ausim tamen pro certo polliceri, rectam scripturam esse *Ἀψῖσι λίνου*. Hesychius alibi: *Ἀψῖσι λίνου, ἄμμασιν ἀπὸ τῆς συναφῆς*. Homerus quinto *Iliadis*:[t]

Μήπως, ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου,
Ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε.

Quid ego de istis dicam, quæ pagella proxima mihi in oculos incurrunt? † *Ἀριστῆραι, δοῦλαι*. Deceptus est similitudine literarum *Α* et *Δ*. Siquidem oportuit *Δριστῆραι*. Ipse alio loco: *Δρηστῆναι, διάκονοι, θεράπαιναι*. lege *Δρηστῆραι*. Verbo monendum est *ῑ*, *ε̅ι*, et *η̅* in Lexicis, præsertim apud hunc nostrum, promiscue usurpari: vera enim analogia requirit, ut *Δρήστειραι* scribamus. Locus est *Odyss. T.*[u]

Τάων, αἵ τοι δῶμα κάτα δρήστειραι ἔασιν.

Vide tamen, ut magnifice de se loquatur ad familiarem suum Eulogium. *Οὐ γάρ*, ait, *ὀκνήσω μετὰ παῤῥησίας εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τῶν Ἀριστάρχου καὶ Ἀπίωνος καὶ Ἡλιοδώρου λέξεων εὐπορήσας, καὶ τὰ βιβλία προσθεὶς Διογενιανοῦ, ὃ πρῶτον καὶ μέγιστον ὑπάρχει πλεονέκτημα, ταῦτα δ' αὐτὸς ἰδίᾳ χειρὶ γράφων ἐγὼ μετὰ πάσης ὀρθότητος καὶ ἀκριβεστάτης γραφῆς κατὰ τὸν γραμματικὸν Ἡρωδιανόν*. Ego vero, qui Theodosii MS[tam] *Ἐπιτομὴν τῆς Καθόλου* Herodiani lectitavi, testificor parum huic promisso vel nullo modo satisfactum esse. † *Ἀρήσθορεν, ἐπήδησεν*. Vitiosius hoc quidem, quam illud alterum *Ἀρέσθορεν, ἐπήδησεν*. Sed ex utraque parte ostendit, non lautissimam doctrinæ supellectilem sibi domi fuisse. Quæ enim hæc conglutinatio verborum, quæ dissolvi denuo divellique desiderant? Hom. *Iliadis M.*[v]

——— *ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ,*
Νυκτὶ θοῇ ἀτάλαντος ὑπώπια.

[t "In Homero Il. E. 487. legisse videtur Hesychius *ἀψῖσι λίνοιο*, quomodo constaret metrum.—N. B. *λίνου πανάγροιο* Ϝαλόντες Bentleius, unice probante Heynio, qui ait *ἁλόντες* aliquoties citari apud Eustathium." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[u v. 345.—D.]

[v v. 462.—D.]

Ἀρενοβοσκὸς, προβατοβοσκός. Mirifice quidem, ut nihil supra. Atqui *ἀρὴν ἀρῆνος*, puto, dicitur, non *ἀρένος*· unde *πολύῤῥηνες*, et *ὅϊς ὑπόῤῥηνος*. Imo, quin iambei principium fuerit apud Sophoclem *Ἀρηνοβοσκὸς* . . . ne dubitandum est quidem. Melius ipse alibi: *Ἀρηνοβοσκὸς, προβατοβοσκὸς, Σοφοκλῆς Τυροῖ καὶ γράφεται δὲ ἐῤῥηνοβοσκὸς διά τε τοῦ * ἕω καὶ τῶν βόρων.* Verum hic quidem locus a librario pessime acceptus est: ipse auctor procul abest a noxa. Lege *Σοφοκλῆς Τυροῖ β̄. γράφεται δὲ καὶ ἐῤῥηνοβοσκὸς διά τε τοῦ ε̄ καὶ τῶν β̄ ῥῶν.* Scribitur, ait, *ἐῤῥηνοβοσκὸς* per literam ε̄, et duplicem ῥ̄.[w] *Etymologicum Magnum:* *Ἐῤῥηνοβοσκὸς, ὁ προβατοβοσκὸς, ἐν Τυροῖ β̄ Σοφοκλῆς.* † *Ἐμπήρους* et *Ἔμπηροι* vitium exemplaris est pro *Ἐμμήρους* et *Ἔμμηροι*. Ipse alibi emendate: *Ἐμμήρους, ἐν ὁμηρείᾳ ὄντας, παρὰ τοὺς ὁμήρους τοὺς ἐπὶ συμβάσει διδομένους.* Totus autem locus ad hunc modum constituendus est: *Ἐμμήρους, Δημήτριος ἐν Σικελίᾳ·*

Λακεδαιμόνιοί θ'[x] *ἡμῶν τὰ τείχη κατέβαλον,*
Καὶ τὰς τριήρεις ἔλαβον ἐμμήρους,[y] *ὅπως*
Μηκέτι θαλαττοκρατοῖντο Πελοποννήσιοι.

Demetrius iste comicus fuit; et illa fabula inscripta est *Sicilia*. Quare perperam hactenus judicarunt viri docti, qui scriptorem eum historicum, orationem autem prosaicam esse censuerunt. Athenæus lib. 3.[z] *Δημήτριος ὁ κωμῳδοποιὸς ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι Σικελίᾳ.* *Etymologici* auctor *Σικελοὺς* inscribit, non *Σικελίαν*· eum vide in *Ἐμμήρους*. † *Χωρονομεῖν, ὀργίζεσθαι.* Oportet ut conniventibus oculis hæc legerit Hesychius. Ego quidem meis vix fidem habeo, cum ista lego. Proculdubio sic scriptum est a prima manu: *Χειρονομεῖν, ὀρχεῖσθαι.* Ipse alibi: *Χειρονόμος, ὀρχηστής.* Manuum iste motus cum certa lege et numero bonam partem saltationis olim constituebat. Plena sunt exemplorum omnia. Lucretius:[a]

[w Confer Brunck. *Lex. Soph.* in v. *Ἐρηνοβ.*, et Schowium ad *Hesych. Suppl.* p. 136.—D.]

[x Vulgo *μεθ' ἡμῶν.*—D.]

[y Vulgo *ἐμπήρους.*—D.]

[z c. lxxiii. t. i. p. 422. ed. Schw.—D.]

[a iv. 772, 789.—D.]

Quod superest, non est mirum, simulacra moveri,
Brachiaque in numerum jactare, et cætera membra.

Et postea:

Quid porro, in numerum procedere quum simulacra
Cernimus in somnis, et mollia membra movere;
Mollia mobiliter quum alternis brachia mittunt.

† *Κάλυψιν, κάλυκα ἀντιστρόφως.* Medium hoc verbum est inter *Καλυδώνιον* et *Κάλυκας.* Agnosco manum et ingenium correctoris: qui videlicet, cum in Hesychio suo legerat *Κάλυψιν, κάλυκα,* idque animadverterat extra seriem et præpostere poni, adscripserat in margine e regione loci *Ἀντιστρόφως*; nempe *vice versa* legi oportere *Κάλυκα, κάλυψιν.* Postea illud *ἀντιστρόφως* per inscitiam librariorum insinuavit se in versum. Quis hujus rei ante nos suspicionem habuit? Quin et alibi post vocem *Προσβάλλοιντο,* quæ et ipsa vitiosa est, hæc leges: *Προσελθὼν, προσβαλὼν ἐξ ἀντιστρόφως.* Dele hoc novissimum, quod nimirum ab emendatore est, qui adnotaverat legendum esse *e converso Προσβαλὼν, προσελθών.* Quo nihil verius dici potuisse censeo: sed in altero, quicunque fuit, longissime a vero abfuit. Profecto plus toto cœlo distant *Κάλυξ* et *Κάλυψις.* Ego vero pro explorato prorsus habeo sic scriptum esse ab Hesychio; *Κάλυζιν, κάλυκα·* nempe depravate loco *Κάλυξιν·* *ζ* pro *ξ·* quem errorem millies erravisse eum, si hic locus esset, nunc possem ostendere. Quam recte autem *Κάλυξιν* interpretetur *κάλυκα,* melius est ut ipsum ad testimonium vocemus: *Καλύξεις, ῥόδων καλύκια. Κάλυξις, κόσμος τις ἐκ ῥόδων.* Habeo alia sexcenta, quæ hac vice condonabitur. Verum hercle si unquam usus fuerit, ut nova Hesychii editio procuretur; qui, ut in pudendos errores crebro inciderit, utilissimus nihilominus et pene necessarius est omnibus, qui ad veram eruditionem viam affectant;

Id tibi de plano possum promittere, Milli,[b]

[[b] Lucret. i. 412.

"*Hoc* tibi de plano possum promittere, *Memmi.*" D.]

quinque plus minus millia mendorum me correcturum esse, si libuerit; quæ aliorum εὐστοχίαν et laboriosam diligentiam hactenus eluserunt.[c] Ut illuc, unde abii, redeam: multos ubique lexicorum locos contaminaverunt correctiones illæ in librorum marginibus: quod ex illo tempore verbum mendosum cum altero junctim continuaretur in versu; non uti factum oportuit, litura tolleretur. Luculentum hujus rei exemplum extat apud Julium Pollucem lib. vii. cap. xxxiii.,[d] ubi inter varia nomina jactuum in ludo talario nominantur ἄρτια et ἁρματίαι, ἀντίτευχος et ἀντίτυπος, ἐπιφένων et ἐπιφόρων. Sed ex hisce binis non nisi singula quæque a Polluce profecta sunt: cætera qua dixi via insinuarunt se in orationem. Cui quidem sententiæ non invitus accedet, qui jam primum a me didicerit iambicos esse trimetros ex Eubuli fabula *Aleatoribus*. Locus hoc exemplo constituendus est. Ὁ μέν τοι Μίδας καὶ τῶν μέσων βόλων ἦν. Καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ πολλοί εἰσιν, οὓς ὀνομάζει Εὔβουλος ἐν τοῖς Κυβευταῖς·

Κεντρωτὸς, ἱερὸς, ἅρμ' ὑπερβάλλον πόδας,
Κήρυνος, εὐδαίμων, κυνῶτος, ἄρτια,
Λάκωνες, ἀντίτευχος, ἀργεῖος, δάκνων,

[c "Sed magni illi viri [Scaliger, Casaubonus, Salmasius, &c.] quæ sentirent, palam dicere non audebant, sive Grammatici auctoritate deterriti, sive clamoribus semidoctorum, semper obstrepentium doctioribus, nec satis æquo animo ferentium, ipsum Hesychium in ordinem cogi. Ad hanc rem proferendam demonstrandamque opus erat docta Richardi Bentleii audacia, quæ, si unquam alias, hic certe bonis literis plus profuit, quam iners et superstitiosa multorum, qui Critici dici haberique volunt, religio. Is igitur servili credulitatis jugo excusso, edidit illam ad J. Millium *Epistolam*, mirabile ingenii et doctrinæ monimentum, quale proficisci non poterat, nisi a principe seculi sui Criticorum. In hac ille epistola cum alia docuit, quæ plerisque eruditis, nec vigilantibus, nec somniantibus, in mentem venissent, tum Hesychium, cui satis diuturna peccatorum impunitas obtigisset, ad severum Critices tribunal citavit. Hanc autem accusationem tanta vi argumentorum, tantis testimoniorum copiis instruxit, ut ne obtrectatores quidem illius, invidia partiumque studiis æstuantes, quos plurimos nactus erat, in hac etiam Academia, contra hiscere, aut Hesychii patrocinium suscipere, auderent."—Verba vides magni Ruhnkenii in Præf. ad Hesychii Albertiani tomum alterum.—D.]

[d p. 843. ed. Hemst., quem vide ad loc.—D.]

Τιμόκριτος, ἐλλείπων, πυαλίτης, ἐπίθετος,
Σφάλλων, ἀγύρτης, οἶστρος, ἀνακάμπτων, δορεὺς,
Λάμπων, κύκλωπες, ἐπιφέρων, σόλων, σίμων.

Horum autem versuum ignoratione tota via erravit Joannes Meursius, qui eos omnes inter jactus medios recenset. Nempe non Eubuli esse verba, sed Pollucis: et quia Midas esset *τῶν μέσων βόλων*, itidem et sequentes esse arbitratus est. Sed parum est dubitationis, quin boni fuerint *εὐδαίμων* et *ἅρμ' ὑπερβάλλον πόδας*, qui nimirum aliis jactibus tanto anteiret, quanto qui pedibus iter faceret, a curru vinceretur; *πεζὸς*, ut aiunt, *ὁδεύων παρὰ Λύδιον ἅρμα.*[d] *Δάκνων* autem et *σφάλλων* et *ἐλλείπων* merito opinor suo pro infelicibus haberi possunt. Sed ad Antiochensem redeo: nam sero sensi longe longeque declinasse me a proposito,

Singula dum capti circumvectamur amore.[e]

Pag. 172. [174.] *Καθὼς ὁ σοφώτατος Εὐριπίδης ἐξέθετο δρᾶμα ποιητικῶς, ὧν μέρος ὀλίγον ἐστὶ ταῦτα.* Multa quidem transcripsit Malelas ex *Iphigenia in Tauris;* quæ ex usu fuerit ad Euripidea exigere, quo de ejus doctrina et fide cognoscamus: si quis ilia tam dura habeat, ut eam molestiam devorare possit. Mihi enim, qui jam lentus et fastidiosus esse cœpi, dabis veniam, si pluria rejiciens et aspernans, unumquidquid quod erit bellissimum carpsero. Velut illud p. 172. in Oraculo: *Εἰ μὴ περάσας Πόντου κύματα, Σκυθίης τε γαῖαν καταλάβοις, Αὐλίδος τε χώραν.* et 173. *κατέφθασεν ἐπὶ τὴν Αὐλίδα, χώραν τῆς Σκυθίας.* Male vero sit vobis quantum est geographorum. Rogo vos, an Scythicam illam Aulidem silentio prætermissam oportuit? quid? an ultra Cimmeriorum fines latitabat *ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένη,*[f] adeo ut nemo vestrum usque eo potuerit oculis contendere? Euge vero, *ὦ Ἰωαννίδιον·* profecto aptus natus es ad omnia abdita

[[d] Vide Erasmi *Adag.* p. 481. ed. 1606.—D.]
[[e] Virg. *Georg.* iii. 285.—D.]
[[f] *Ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε,*
Ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι. Hom. *Od.* xi. 14.—D.]

et retrusa contemplanda: tam acri es acie et mentis et oculorum.

Sed tamen amoto quæramus seria ludo.[g]

Geminam *Iphigeniam* etiam pueri sciunt Euripidem docuisse, *τὴν ἐν Ταύροις* et *τὴν ἐν Αὐλίδι*. Joannes, cum Tauros esse Scythas ab aliquo didicisset, etiam Aulidem, quæ Bœotiæ oppidum est, regionem iis finitimam esse arbitratus est. P. 173. *Τούτους δὲ ἑωρακότες βουκόλοι, ἔδραμον πρὸς τὴν Ἰφιγένειαν, λέγοντες αὐτῇ· Ἀγαμέμνονος καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας κόρη, ἥκασι δύο νεανίσκοι παρὰ τὴν κυανέαν·* quæ ex his Euripideis[h] expressa sunt:

Βουκ. *Ἀγαμέμνονος, παῖ, καὶ Κλυταιμνήστρας κόρη,*[i]
Ἄκουε καινῶν ἐξ ἐμοῦ κηρυγμάτων.
Ἰφ. *Τί δ' ἐστι τοῦ παρόντος ἐκπλῆσσον λόγου;*
Βουκ. *Ἥκουσιν εἰς γῆν Κυανεᾶν συμπληγάδων*
Πλάτῃ φυγόντες δίπτυχοι νεανίαι.

Vides Antiochensem hunc ita *ἐπαριστέρως* accepisse sententiam Euripidis; tanquam si *εἰς γῆν Κυανέαν* conjunctim dixisset. Vos iterum appello de terra hac Cyanea; vos qui geographiæ magistros vos pollicemini. Quid autem mussitatis? nam Joannem ea loca convisisse Cedrenus affirmat, prorsus *οἴκοθεν ὁ μάρτυς*. Damno itaque stultitiam meam, qui *Κυανεᾶν* cum *συμπληγάδων* componebam hactenus. Atque hercle vero serio, nequid dissimulem, non placet iste locus: neque enim video cur ii bubulci sermone Dorico uterentur. Quid, malum, an Siculos se esse somniabant, non Tauro-Scythas?

Δωρίσδεν δ' ἔξεστι, δοκῶ, τοῖς Δωριέεσσιν[j]

Atqui[k] quantumvis essent Dorienses, si *πλατειάσδοισαν* suam dialecton extra chorum adhibuissent, rus continuo vel in

[g Hor. *Serm.* l. 1. 27.—D.]
[h *Iph. in Taur.* v. 238. ed. Markl.—v. 228. ed. Matt.—D.]
[i *τέκνον.* Eurip. edd. omnes.—D.]
[j Theoc. *Idyl.* xv. 93.—D.]
[k Vide Valcken. ad Eurip. *Phœn.* v. 11.—D.]

ultimas terras mandati essent non sine infortunio. Sciunt id qui harum literarum gustum aliquem habent. Adde orationem solœcam esse; ut quidem nunc habetur: sed certe, si pro sano locutus est, sic scripsit Euripides:

Ἥκουσιν εἰς γῆν, κυανέας συμπληγάδας
Πλάτῃ φυγόντες δίπτυχοι νεανίαι.

aut, si illud *Κυανέαν* antiquitatis causa servare velis, quandoquidem qua vixit Malelas tempestate jam in libris inveteraverat; in hunc modum:

Ἥκουσιν εἰς γῆν, κυανέαν συμπληγάδων[l]
Πέτραν φυγόντες δίπτυχοι νεανίαι.

velut postea loquitur, *Κἀγώ σε σώσω κυανέας ἔξω πέτρας.*[m] Eleganter autem *κυανέαν πέτραν συμπληγάδων*, ut nihil supra. Sic Virgilius:

Quales Threicia cum flumina Thermodontis.[n]

et Lucretius:

Pulverulenta Ceres, et Etesia flabra Aquilonum.[o]

et iterum:

Ut Babylonica Chaldæum doctrina refutans.[p]

et tertium:

Impellant ut eam Magnesia flamina saxi.[q]

Sic legendi sunt duo loci novissimi; in libris vulgatis minus emendati feruntur.

[[l] *Κυανέαν Συμπληγάδα.* edd. Markl. et Matt.—D.]

[[m] v. 746. ed. Markl.—v. 729. ed. Matt.—D.]

[[n] *Æn.* xi. 659. Vulgo "Threiciæ."—"*Threicia* vitium operarum ed. N. Heins." Heynius ad loc.: sed videas Bentleium apud Wakef. ad Lucret. vi. 1062.—D.]

[[o] V. 741.—D.]

[[p] V. 726. . . . . "Chaldæam." ed. Haverc.—"Chaldæûm." ed. Wakef.—Confer Bentleii Annot. ad calcem Lucret. ed. Wakef. (1813.) t. iv. p. 444.—D.]

[[q] VI. 1062. . . . . *Magnesî semina* saxi." ed. Haverc.—"Magnesia *flumina* saxi." ed. Wakef., ubi vide Bentleium ad loc., et in Annot. t. iv. p. 456.—D.]

P. 176. *Τοῦ Πελοπείου γένους σήμαντρον ἔχει, ἐλαίαν ἐν τῷ ὤμῳ.* Jam hoc pro explorato habeo, *ἐλαίαν* ab hac pecude positam esse pro *ἐλέφαντα.* Cui enim fando auditum est, oleaginum humerum fuisse Pelopi?

Cui non dictus Hylas puer, et Latonia Delos,
Hippodameque, humeroque Pelops insignis eburno?[q]

Ἐπεί νιν καθαροῦ λέβητος ἔξελε
Κλωθώ, ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον
Ὦμον κεκαδμένον.[r]

Alia multa sunt apud Malelam ex eadem fabula tralata, quæ missa facio. Cur enim me mancipium faciam *παραφρονοῦντος δεσπότου*?[s] Majoris fuerit et voluptatis et fructus cognoscere, quæ *summus poeta Ennius* de priore *Iphigenia* convertit. Julius Rufinianus *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis*:[t] *Aganactesis, indignatio, quæ fit maxime pronunciatione. Ennius in Iphigenia: Menelaus me objurgat, id meis rebus regimen restat.* Dormitavit hic vir summus Ger. Vossius. Nam, si unam syllabam addideris, trochaicus erit catalecticus:

Menelaus me objurgat: id meis rebu' regimen restitat,

quod genus versus commodissime inservit *τῇ ἀγανακτήσει*· ut diu est quod ipse in tragicis Græcis observavi; priusquam id de Scholiaste Hermogenis didicissem. Idem Rufinianus postea:[u] *Syncrisis, sive antithesis, comparatio rerum atque personarum inter se contrariarum: ut, ego plector,*[v] *quod tu peccas: tu delinquis, ego arguor pro malefactis: Helena redeat, virgo pereat innocens: tua reconcilietur uxor, mea necetur filia.*[w] Hunc etiam locum ad Ennii *Iphigeniam* refert Italorum doctissimus Hieronymus Columna: invito tamen et repugnante Vossio, partim quia auctor non laudatur,

[q Virg. *Georg.* iii. 6.—D.]
[r Pind. *Ol.* i. 40. ed. Heyn.—D.]
[s Aristoph. *Plut.* v. 2.—D.]
[t p. 205. ed. Ruhnk. (ad calcem Rutil. Lup.)—D.]
[u p. 222. ed. Ruhnk.—D.]
[v *plector* pro vulg. *projector*, est e Pithœi et G. J. Vossii conjectura.—D.]
[w *mea necetur filia* pro vulg. *mea negetur, filia mea*, corr. Columna.—D.]

partim quia non vincta sed pedestris oratio est; ad quod mirum, ait, non attendisse Columnam. Peccet Columna, et peccat quidem, in versibus: ego vero, cum certis signis hunc Ennii fœtum cognoscam, non committam ut alium, quam quo natus est, parentem sibi inveniat. Versus enim sunt trochaici, ex eadem puto scena petiti, qua superior est:

Ut ego plectar, quod tu peccas; tu delinquis, ego arguar
Pro malefactis? Helena redeat, virgo pereat innocens?
Tua reconcilietur uxor, mea necetur filia?[v]

Non amplius, quod sciam, Euripides a Malela citatur præterquam p. 35. *Ὁ Ταῦρος ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἔσχεν*[w] *υἱὸν τὸν Μίνω, καθὼς καὶ Εὐριπίδης ὁ σοφώτατος ποιητικῶς συνεγράψατο· ὥς φησι, Ζεὺς μεταβληθεὶς εἰς ταῦρον τὴν Εὐρώπην ἥρπασεν.* Hæc quidem unde accersita sint, non certo scio: nam credibile est eum in non una tragœdia hæc obiter attigisse; ut in *Cretensibus* fortassis, ubi chorus ad Minoem; *Φοινικογενοῦς παῖ τῆς Τυρίας Τέκνον Εὐρώπης καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου Ζηνός*:[x] veri tamen simile est ex Euripidis *Phrixo* tralata esse. Eratosthenes in *Καταστερισμοῖς*.[y] (*Ταῦρος*) *λέγεται ἐν τοῖς ἄστροις τεθῆναι διὰ τὸ Εὐρώπην ἀγαγεῖν ἐκ Φοινίκης εἰς Κρήτην διὰ τοῦ πελάγους, ὡς Εὐριπίδης* [*φησὶν*] *ἐν τῷ Φρίξῳ.* Profecto qui *Europam* tragœdiam esse volunt, narrant nobis insomnium ex eburnea porta.

Pag. 181. *Ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τοῖς*[z] *μετὰ τὴν ἅλωσιν Τροίας, παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἐθαυμάζετο πρῶτος Θέμις ὀνόματι· ἐξεῦρε*[a] *γὰρ οὗτος τραγικὰς μελῳδίας, καὶ ἐξέθετο πρῶτος δράματα, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Μίνως, καὶ μετὰ Μίνωα Αὐλέας τραγικοὺς χοροὺς δραμάτων συνεγράψατο.* Utinam vero Malelæ cum præcursore suo melius conveniret! nam Jubal, si ei credimus, diu ante Trojæ excidium tragœdias factitavit.

[v "De Ennii loco apud Jul. Rufin. (p. 222. ed. Ruhnken.) non liquet. Primum, *ego* melius in *arsi* collocaretur. Deinde, modus subjunctivus per omnia servari debere videtur. Et *delinquas* quidem habet ed. B. Rhenani, quæ sola ex MSS. petita est. An legendum, *Egone plectar, quod tu peccas? delinquas tu, ego arguar?* Sed, ne quid dissimulem, valde displicent Tu Ego in *thesi:* quare ampliandum." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 364.—D.]

[w Ἐξ ἧς ἔσχεν. Mal.—D.]

[x Vide supra, p. 271.—D.]

[y cap. 14. p. 12. ed. Schaub.—D.]

[z δὲ τοῖς. Mal.—D.]

[a ἐξηῦρε. Mal.—D.]

Verba, ne te ludere videar, sunt p. 3. *Ὁ δὲ (Ἰουβὰλ) κιθαρῳδίας καὶ τραγῳδίας τοῖς δαιμονικοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι προσεπενόησεν.* Quid quod ad soccum haud minus idoneus erat, si interpretem audis, quam ad cothurnum. Nam *κιθαρῳδία* Chilmeado est *comœdia;* qui, cum ad alios ingenii cultus etiam musicæ studium adjunxerit, cur adeo ab artificio suo recederet, miror: clementer tamen, propter alia merita, suaque quasi lyra est increpandus. Vix equidem crediderim in Bibliotheca vestra Oxonii, quantacunque est, Jubaliana dramata reperiri. Scilicet ea omnia perierunt olim;

Quando ex diluvio magno exivere rapaces
Per terras amnes, atque oppida cooperuere.[b]

Quarum fabularum una cum ipsis etiam memoria occidisset, absque illo Hamartolo[c] fuisset, qui omnia omnino meminit, quæ fuerunt, et quæ nullo sunt tempore nata. Habeo tamen, quo desiderium meum et dolorem consoler; nam in mentem opportune venit fieri posse, ut locus iste vitiosus sit, et in hunc modum emendandus: *Ὁ δὲ (Ἰουβὰλ) κιθαρῳδίας καὶ λυρῳδίας τοῖς ἁρμονικοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασι προσεπενόησεν.* Et profecto quam magis magisque cogito, nimirum acu rem tetigi; sin autem, nolim mihi quenquam posthac ne jurato quidem credere. Tandem igitur aliquando lite hac composita, quantulum est tamen quod profecimus, si Joannes ipse pugnantia loquatur? Non enim jam ab Ilio capto primus mortalium Themis dramata fecit: siquidem ante istam memoriam Ægypti rex Pharao, ubi a negotiis et turbis requiescere volebat, solitus est comœdias scriptitare. Verba sunt Joannis p. 76. *Τῶν δὲ Αἰγυπτίων ἐβασίλευσε Πετισσώνιος ὁ κωμῳδὸς Φαραώ.* Quid rides? Quasi vero novum nunc proferatur, regem ad fabulas scribendas animum appulisse. Etiam Dionysius tyrannus poeta fuit tragicus, et Augusti

[[b] Audi ipsum poetam:—
"*Aut cecidisse urbeis* magno *vexamine mundi,*
Aut ex *imbribus adsiduis exisse* rapaceis
Per terras amneis, atque oppida *cooperuisse.*" *Lucret.* V. 341.—D.]

[[c] "Quod spectat ad ista quæ huic Editioni præmittuntur *Chronologica,* sub titulo *Autoris Anonymi Excerptorum Chronologicorum:* non alia sunt ea quam *Chronici Georgii Monachi* cognominati *Hamartoli* sive *Peccatoris* principium." Hodius, *Proleg. in Malelam,* s. xli.—D.]

Ajax in spongiam incubuit.[c] Quanquam, si emendate loqui velimus, *κωμῳδὸς* non *comicus* est, sed *comœdiæ actor*. Histrioniam igitur fecit Pharao; Thrasonis, opinor, vel Pyrgolopolinicis partes agens; ut Nero postea Œdipodis vel Creontis. Verum hæc ipsius Malelæ stultitiam superant; ut ea qui dixerit, non pro homine sano loqui, sed ad agnatos et gentiles deducendus esse videatur. Sine dubio vitium est exemplaris, quo tamen modo tollendum sit, minus id possum conjectura assequi. Quid si legamus, *Πετισσώνιος, ὁ τῷ Μωσεῖ Φαραώ· Petissonius, qui a Mose Pharao vocatur?* Si caput scaberem fortasse aliud melius possem exsculpere: sed indignus est Joannes, cujus causa commentari velim quidquam, nisi si quid ex facili nascatur. Itaque ut ad Themin istum propius accedamus. Eadem cum Antiochensi narrat, et in eodem doctus est ludo *Scholiastes vetus* nescio quis apud Stanleium in *Vita Æschyli*:[d] *Ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Ὀρέστου ἐθαυμάζετο παρ' Ἕλλησι Θέμις, ὃς πρῶτος ἐξεῦρε τραγῳδικὰς μελῳδίας, καὶ ἐξέθετο πρῶτος δράματα. Καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν Μίνως, καὶ μετὰ Μίνωα Αὐλέας χοροὺς τραγικοὺς συνεστήσατο.* Hæc habet doctissimus noster Stanleius ex Bullengeri *Theatro*. Et tamen neuter de Themide, de Minoe vel Aulea, quod quam diligentissime factum oportuit, certiores nos facit. Concurrant jam omnes, quantum est *βιβλιοτάφων*, et capita inter se conferant; nunquam se expedient, neque quidquam de tergeminis hisce tragicis resciscent. Narrat Clemens *Στρωματέων*[e] primo *τὸ ἡρῷον τὸ ἑξάμετρον . . . . Θέμιν μίαν τῶν Τιτανίδων εὑρηκέναι*, Minoem autem *τοὺς νόμους*·[f] sed quod ad præsens negotium attinet, vacuum a se lectorem et hiantem dimittit. Quid enim *νόμοι* Minois ad nomos musicos? *Τί πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον;*[g] neque heroes in tragœdiis heroos hexametros dicebant. Itaque quantum video, perpetua jam criticis sollici-

[c Vide Sueton. in *August.* c. 85.—D.]

[d Stanl. *In Vitam Æsch. Com.* p. 700. ed. 1664. = p. 57. ed. Butl.—D.]

[e p. 366. ed. Pott., ubi . . . . *εὑρεῖν*.—D.] [f p. 365. ed. Pott.—D.]

[g Vide Suidam in *Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόν.*, et nostrum in *Dissert. de Phalar.* t. i. p. 293.—D.]

tudo et quasi crux constituta est: nisi Callimachi *Πίνακας* et Aristophanis Grammatici Commentarium longa nocte sepultos protrahere possunt in lucem. Verum heus vos! Ecquid erit præmî,[b] si nodum hunc solvero? quod quidem ea lege et conditione faciam; ut dehinc mihi cum vestra natione nullum omnino commercium intercedat. Enimvero ab Antiochensi et ficulno illo, quicunque est, Scholiaste gravissime peccatum est, cum in nominibus tum in rebus ipsis. Prorsus quot verba, tot errata. Neque enim agnosco commentitios istos Theomin, Minoem, Auleam; quorum ego loco non dubia conjectura repono Thespin, Ionem, Æschylum:[c] neque Thespis ea, qua rentur, tempestate vixit; nam Solonis æqualis a Troicis temporibus longissime abfuit: neque Ion Æschylo prior fuit: neque primus Æschylus choros tragicos instituit; quod contra chorum, qui perpetua ante oratione totam fabulam decantabat, primus diverbiis et personis distinxit. Sed operæ pretium fuerit accuratius hæc omnia tractare. Ac de Thespide quidem minor est dubitatio, quia in discipulorum cathedris quotidie ista jactantur:

> Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camenæ
> Dicitur, et plaustris vexisse poemata Thespis.[d]

Suidas: *Θέσπις .. ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης καὶ ξ̄ Ὀλυμπιάδος· μνημονεύεται δὲ τῶν δραμάτων αὐτοῦ, Ἆθλα Πελίου ἢ Φορβὰς, Ἱερεῖς, Ἡίθεοι, Πενθεύς.* *Pentheus* fabula a Polluce laudatur lib. vii. c. xii.[e] (*Τὸ ὄνομα ἐπενδύτης*) *ληπτέον ἐκ τῶν Σοφοκλέους Πλυντριῶν, Πέπλους τενίσαι λινοπλυνεῖς τ' ἐπενδύτας· καὶ Θέσπις δέ που φησὶν ἐν τῷ Πενθεῖ· Ἔργῳ νόμιζε νευρίδας ἔχειν ἐπενδύτην.* De quo versu[f] cum nihil in præsentia succurrat, quod mihi satisfaciat, ejus emen-

[[b] Ed. Oxon. *Epist. ad Mill.* "Ecquid erit *pretii*," quod mihi quidem melius videtur.—D.]

[[c] Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 553.—D.]

[[d] Hor. in *Arte Poet.* v. 275.—D.] [[e] p. 717. ed. Hemst.—D.]

[[f] "Postea, Dissert. Phalarid. 2da, p. 245. expedivit Pseudo-Thespidis locum, *νεβρίδ' ἔχειν.* Sed *forsan* non delendum, sed transponendum σ̄. *νεβρίδ' ἔχειν σ'* pro *νεβρίδα σ' ἔχειν.*" Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 554., et in *Dissert. de Phalar.* t. i. p. 295. —D.]

dationem in aliud tempus differam: Sophocleum illum sine mora expediam. Neque enim cum Casaubono, Meursio et Gatakero *κτενίσαι* substituerim; cujus media syllaba est brevis; versumque redderet una syllaba breviorem. Non enim diiambus est *λινοπλυνεῖς*, sed pæon quartus. Neque Gatakeri *νεοπλύντους ἐπενδύτας* probaverim; nam sedes quarta spondæum non admittit; poterat paullo rectius *νεοπλύτους*. Sed aliud quiddam prætulerim, de quo ausim tibi firmissime asseverare:

Πέπλους τε νῆσαι λινοπλυνεῖς τ' ἐπενδύτας.[g]

Diversa ab illis, quas Suidas recenset, fabula habetur in veteri Marmore Arundeliano, quod nunc est Oxonii: *ΑΦ ΟΥ ΘΕΣΠΙΣ Ο ΠΟΙΗΤΗΣ .... ΑΧΙ ... ΟΣ ΕΔΙΔΑΞΕΝ ΑΛ ... ΣΤΙΝ.* Supple *ΑΛΚΗΣΤΙΝ*, *Ἄλκηστιν*· non *Ἀλκέστιν*, ut minus recte Editores.[h] Locus est illustris apud Clementem in *Στρωματέων* quinto;[i] quem nefas quidem fuerit silentio prætermittere. *Θέσπις μέν τοι ὁ τραγικὸς διὰ[j] τούτων ἄλλο τι σημαίνεσθαί φησιν, ὧδέ πως γράφων·*

Ἴδε σοι σπένδω κναξζβὶ τὸ λευκὸν[k]
Ἀπὸ θηλαμόνων θλίψας κνακῶν.
Ἴδε σοι χθύπτην τυρὸν μίξας
Ἐρυθρῷ μέλιτι, κατὰ τῶν σῶν, Πὰν
Δικέρως, τίθεμαι βωμῶν ἁγίων.
Ἴδε σοι Βρομίου αἴθοπα φλεγμὸν[l]
Λείβω.

Hæc narrat Clemens ex Thespide: ex aliis alia, quæ ad eandem rem spectant. Persuasum est hactenus viris eru-

[g Confer nostrum in Addendis, et in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 553. Hunc versum post Canterum et Bentleium sic dedit Brunckius (*Lex. Sophoc.* in Ἐπενδύτης),

Πέπλους τε νῆσαι, νεοπλυνεῖς τ' ἐπενδύτας. D.]

[h Vide omnino nostrum in *Dissert. de Phalar.* t. i. p. 290. sqq.—D.]

[i p. 675. ed. Pott.—Vide *Dissert. de Phalar.* t. i. p. 291.—D.]

[j *παρὰ.* ed. Pott.—D.]

[k *κναξζβὶ λευκόν.* Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 565.—D.]

[l *φλογμόν.* ed. Pott.—D.]

ditis, magnam symbolicæ et ænigmaticæ veterum theologiæ vim in barbaris illis vocabulis contineri. Rem igitur haud ingratam facturum me spero, si refregero hæc claustra, quæ a multis sæculis omnem ad hæc sacra aditum præcluserunt. Quod autem Herculem ferunt dixisse, cum in delubro quodam conspexisset simulacrum Adonidis, *Οὐδὲν ἱερὸν ὑπάρχειν*·[i] idem mihi jam usu venit, hoc adyto recluso. Videlicet erat olim ridicula et puerilis ratio; ut ex quatuor et viginti literis, semel duntaxat positis singulis, barbara quædam et infaceta verba conficerent, prout cuique libitum fuerit. Clemens hanc appellat *στοιχειωτικὴν τῶν παίδων διδασκαλίαν*. Postea certandum erat ingenio, ut sententiam istorum verborum aliquam omnibus vestigiis indagarent; non eam quidem omnino alienam et absonam, sed a propinquo si fieri potuit, et verisimili petitam. Tria profert Clemens exempla eorum *ὑπογραμμῶν παιδικῶν*· quorum unum hoc est:

Μάρπτε, σφὶγξ, κλὼψ, ζβυχθηδόν.[j]

Ita scribi oportere res ipsa clamat; non ut in editis, *μάρπτες* et *ζυνχθηδόν*· calculum jam pone, et omnes omnino literas Cadmi, Palamedis, Simonidis, in quatuor istis vocabulis invenies. Ecce tibi secundum:

Βέδυ, ζὰμψ, χθὼ, πλῆκτρον, σφίγξ.[k]

Ita legendum, non ut in vulgatis, *ζὰψ* et *χθών*· nam eo pacto et M litera deesset, et N bis poneretur. Tamen ut *λάμβδα λάβδα*, sic illud *ζὰμψ* auctores Græci *ζὰψ* scripsisse et pronunciasse videntur: sic etiam *κάψα* dicunt et *κάμψα*· sic *λήψεται* in antiquissimis MSS. scribitur *λήμψεται*, et multa similia.[l] Tertium denique est illud Thespidis:

Κναξζβὶ, χθύπτης, φλεγμὼ, δρόψ.[m]

Male apud Clementem est editum *φλεγμὸς, δρώψ*· ut liquido

[i Vide Schol. Theocr. V. 21., et Suid. in *Οὐδὲν ἱερόν*.—D.]

[j p. 675. ed. Pott.—D.] [k p. 674. ed. Pott.—D.]

[l Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 554.—Vide etiam Schowium ad *Hesych. Suppl.* p. 414.—D.]

[m p. 674. ed. Pott.—D.]

constabit, si digitis computans literarum numerum velis inire. Quam mirifice autem Clemens hæc omnia quantumvis inepta et ludicra interpretetur, malim ex ipso quam ex me audias. Aliter paullo hæc ultima ab Hesychio proferuntur; nam pro *κναξζβὶ χθύπτης, κνὰξ* habet et *ζβὶχ* et *θύπτης*. *Κνὰξ* autem interpretatur *γάλα λευκὸν, ζβὶχ* (ita lege, non *ζαβὶχ*) *λευκὸν*, et *θύπτης ὁ τυρός*. Atque hujus auctoritate inductus Salmasius[n] verba Thespidis ad hunc modum immutare voluit:

Ἴδε σοι σπένδω κνὰξ ζβὶχ λευκόν,

et

Ἴδε σοι θύπτην τυρὸν μίξας.

Sed profecto non ea est Hesychii auctoritas; neque plus habet momenti, quam Clementis et Porphyrii hominum multis partibus illo doctiorum. Non enim librarii culpa est apud Clementem: neque ulla similitudo veri est χ literam a verbo *κναξζβὶ* fortuito disjunctam fuisse, et tertio post versu repositam. Porphyrii autem hoc *ἀποσπασμάτιον* est ex libro MS^to Oxonii.

ΠΟΡΦΥΡΙΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΥ

Περὶ τοῦ Κναξζβὶ, χθύπτης, φλεγμὼ, δρὸψ ἑρμηνεία.

Ἐν Δελφοῖς εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἐπιγέγραπται τράγος ἰχθύϊ ἐπὶ δελφῖνος ἐπικείμενος. Κνὰξ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τράγος κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κως (lege *κων*) *καὶ πάλιν ἀφαίρεσιν* (imo *πρόσθεσιν*) *τοῦ ξ. κνάκον γὰρ καλεῖται, ὡς καὶ Θεόκριτος ἐν βουκόλοις λέγει. οἷον τράγος καὶ ἰχθὺς,*[o] *ὁ μὲν φλεγόμενος, ὁ δὲ δρὸψ ὄψον. Λέγει δὲ ὅτι ὁ τράγος φλεγόμενός ἐστι πάντοτε ὑπὸ λαγνίας, ὅτι ἐάν τις τὰς ῥῖνας αὐτοῦ ἀποσφαλίσει* (leg. *ἀπασφαλίσῃ*), *διὰ τῶν κεράτων ἀναπνεῖ. Ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἑτέραν ἑρμηνείαν οὕτως· Τὸ κναξζβὶ*

[[n] *Plin. Exercit.* p. 629.—D.]

[[o] "*καὶ ἰχθὺς, κ. τ. λ.* Hæc verba, gravissime corrupta, ad hunc fere modum sunt legenda: *καὶ τὸ μὲν χθύπτης ἰχθὺς, τὸ δὲ φλεγμὼ φλεγόμενος, τὸ δὲ δρὸψ* — N.B. *τὸ* (i. e. ὃ) infra, *τὸ κναξβὶ*, etc." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]

γάλα ἐστὶν, τὸ δὲ χθύπτης τυρὸς, δρὸψ δὲ ἄνθρωπος· δρῶπες γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγονται. Καὶ ἕτερα δὲ πλεῖστα τοιαῦτα διὰ τῶν κδ στοιχείων ἀπαρτίζοντα ἴδιον σκοπὸν εὕρομεν, οἷον· Βέδυ, ζὰψ, χθὼ, πλῆκτρον, σφίγξ. ὅ ἐστιν οὕτως· Βέδυ ἐστὶν ἡ ὑγρὰ οὐσία, ζὰψ ἡ πυρώδης οὐσία, χθὼ ἡ γῆ, πλῆκτρον δὲ ὁ ἀὴρ, σφὶγξ ἡ τούτων φιλία διὰ τὸ συνεσφίγχθαι. Κλώδιος δὲ ὁ Νεαπολίτης οὕτως ἡρμήνευσε τὸ προκείμενον· ἀὴρ, θάλασσα, γῆ, ἥλιος. Καὶ ἕτεροί τινες φιλόσοφοί τε καὶ ποιηταὶ τοῦτον τὸν σκοπὸν ἡρμήνευσαν.

Non longe a principio sic scribe: κνάκων γὰρ καλεῖται, ὡς ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐν Βουκολικοῖς λέγει. Locus est *Idyllio* tertio:[p]

——————καὶ τὸν ἐνόρχαν
Τὸν Λιβυκὸν κνάκωνα φυλάσσεο, μὴ τὺ κορύψῃ.

Illud autem nimis festivum est, quod aliquanto post sequitur: capras scilicet, siquis iis nares obturet, cornibus spirare. Sed pro κεράτων certissime emendandum est οὐάτων vel ὤτων. Varro *De Re Rustica*:[q] *De quibus admirandum illud, quod etiam Archelaus scribit; (capras) non, ut reliqua animalia, naribus, sed auribus spiritum ducere solere.* Idem narrant Plinius et Ælianus. Clodius iste Neapolitanus librum composuit adversus eos, qui carne abstinerent; ut testis est ipse Porphyrius περὶ ἀποχῆς ἐμψύχων· neque alius quisquam illius meminit, quod sciam. Fidem id facit, minime ψευδεπίγραφα hæc esse, sed ex Porphyrio bona fide excerpta.

P. 181. Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο Μίνως, καὶ μετὰ Μίνωα Αὐλέας. Dixi meam sententiam: nimirum aut vitio codicis aut memoriæ falsum esse Joannem; et ad hunc modum a prima manu scriptum videri, Καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον Ἴων, καὶ μετὰ Ἴωνα Αἰσχύλος. Porro iste Ion poeta fuit tragicus, natione Chius: de quo ideo plura dicemus, quia Thespide et Æschylo aliquanto est ignotior; tum autem ut quasi specimen demus istius operis, cujus antea fecimus mentionem,[r] quo *Reliquias*

[p v. 4.—*Poetæ Min. Gr.* t. ii. p. 31. ed. Gaisf., ubi . . . . μὴ τὺ κορύξῃ.—D.]
[q Lib. ii. cap. iii. p. 81. ed. 1573.—D.]
[r Vide supra, p. 267.—D.]

omnis Græcæ Poeseos, Philosophicæ, Epicæ, Elegiacæ, Dramaticæ, Lyricæque colligere voluimus. Sed hæc fuerunt. Principio autem non injuria Chius noster una cum Æschylo memoratur, cui olim amicitia et familiaritate conjunctus fuit; ut ex Plutarcho constat in libro qui inscribitur *Πῶς ἄν τις αἴσθοιτο ἑαυτοῦ προκόπτοντος ἐπ' ἀρετῇ*.[8] *Αἰσχύλος*, ait, ... *Ἰσθμοῖ θεώμενος ἀγῶνα πυκτῶν, ἐπεὶ πληγέντος ἑτέρου τὸ θέατρον ἐξέκραγε, νύξας Ἴωνα τὸν Χῖον, Ὁρᾷς, ἔφη, οἷον ἡ ἄσκησίς ἐστιν· ὁ πεπληγὼς σιωπᾷ, οἱ δὲ θεώμενοι βοῶσι.* Juvenis tamen cum sene versatus est; et in eo quidem non leviter peccatum est a Joanne, quod Ionem Æschylo vetustiorem faciat. Utinam vero superesset hodie Batonis Sinopensis liber: plura de Ionis ætate, et evidentiora dici possent: nunc soli in obscuro lubricoque tramite magis reptamus, quam pedetentim ingredimur. Platonis est Dialogus, quo Socrates sermonem instituit cum Ione quodam Ephesio; quem a Chio non esse diversum opinio est Lilii Gyraldi, Julii Scaligeri, Delrii, et Menagii: quæ si vera est sententia, non opus est ut multa dicamus. Statim enim constabit Ionem Æschylo fuisse natu minorem. Quippe Socrates natus Olymp. LXXVII. anno IV., tantummodo XIII. ætatis annum agebat, cum Æschylus ex vita excessit, videlicet Olymp. LXXXI. an. I., Callia Athenis archonte. Sed de Ephesio isto pugnant adversus Gyraldum et Scaligerum eruditissimi quidem homines Leo Allatius et Joannes Jonsius: ille contumeliis fretus, et eo quod nullo auctore primus id dixerit Gyraldus, quodque Ephesius rhapsodus fuerit, non tragicus; hic autem acerrimo telo armatus, quia ratio temporum reclamat: scilicet Ionem Chium Olymp. LXXII. tragœdias docuisse non minus annos viginti priusquam Socrates nasceretur, Olymp. demum LXXVII. IV. Mihi quidem idem est animus, non unum et eundem fuisse Chium et Ephesium: Chius enim et genere et opibus fuit clarus: qui cum Athenis quondam tragœdia simul et dithyrambo vicisset, Chii vini

[8 *Mor.* t. i. p. 211. ed. Wyttenb.—D.]

cadum viritim cuique civium dedit; ut memorant Athenæus[t] et Comici enarrator ad *Pacem*.[u] Luculentæ vero divitiæ, quæ tam eximiæ liberalitati sufficere potuerunt. Ephesius homo mendicus et circumforaneus cantitando et gesticulando victum inopem quæritans, ut mos erat rhapsodis, quos Homerus suus misella stipe et esuritione pascebat. Ipse de se loquitur apud Platonem:[v] *Δεῖ γάρ με καὶ σφόδρ' αὐτοῖς (τοῖς θεαταῖς) τὸν νοῦν προσέχειν, ὡς ἐὰν μὲν κλαίοντας αὐτοὺς καθίζω, αὐτὸς γελάσομαι ἀργύριον λαμβάνων· ἐὰν δὲ γελῶντας, αὐτὸς κλαύσομαι ἀργύριον ἀπολλύς.* Chius in omni literarum genere magnum nomen est consecutus: Ephesius præter Homerum nihil doctus cantare; sicut de se fatetur: cum a Socrate interrogatus, utrum Homerum solum calleret, an etiam Hesiodum et Archilochum; respondit, minime quidem istos, sed Homerum solum, atque hoc satis esse. Et aliquanto post, *Ὅταν μέν τις*, ait, *περὶ τοῦ ἄλλου ποιητοῦ διαλέγεται, οὐδὲ προσέχω νοῦν, ἀδυνατῶ τε καὶ ὁτιοῦν συμβαλέσθαι λόγου ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς νυστάζω,*[w] et alia pluria in hanc sententiam. Sic igitur persuasum habeo, Chio illi et Ephesio patriam, genus, fortunas, ingenium, studia, mores, omnia denique præter nomen et ætatem disparia fuisse. Et ætatem quidem cum dico, cave cum Jonsio, Menagio, et Gerardo Vossio ad Olymp. LXXII. Ionem Chium rejicias, qui in erubescendum errorem inciderunt inscii,

Et graviter magni magno cecidere ibi casu:[x]

ab hominum futilissimo Æmilio Porto decepti, qui Suidæ[y] verba, *Ἤρξατο τὰς τραγῳδίας διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῆς* $\overline{\pi\beta}$ *Ὀλυμπιάδος*, ita Latina fecit, tanquam si Ion Olymp. LXXII. scribere cœpisset. Atqui, O bone, $\overline{\pi\beta}$ sunt LXXXII.: et Scho-

[t Ep. lib. i. c. v. t. i. p. 12. ed. Schw., quem vide in *Animadv.* t. i. p. 39. et p. 489.—D.]

[u v. 801. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[v *Ion.*—Plat. *Opp.* t. ii. p. 455. ed. 1826., ubi . . . *κλάοντας* . . . *καθίσω*.—D.]

[w Ibid. p. 438., ubi . . . . *περὶ ἄλ. τοῦ ποι. διαλέγηται, οὔτε προσ. τὸν νοῦν, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]

[x Lucret. i. 742.—D.]

[y In v. *Ἴων*.—D.]

liastes Comici non numerorum notas, verum integra verba exhibet, *ἐπὶ ὀγδοηκοστῆς καὶ δευτέρας Ὀλυμπιάδος*. Facile igitur per ætatem licitum est, usum et consuetudinem Ioni Chio cum Socrate fuisse. Quin ipse in suis scriptis Socratis mentionem fecit. Diogenes Laërt.[x] *Ἴων δὲ ὁ Χῖος καὶ νέον ὄντα (τὸν Σωκράτην) εἰς Σάμον σὺν Ἀρχελάῳ ἐπιδημῆσαί (φησι)*. Quid Allatius, malevolentia et livor, non homo? quam falsus est animi, cum Gyraldum credidit primum in ea opinione fuisse? Ecce tibi e transverso Suidas: jampridem is in *Διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι* idem cum Gyraldo senserat. *Καὶ Σωκράτους τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐστὶ λόγος εἰς αὐτόν*. Portus haud præter solitum perverse, ut nihil magis: *Extat Socratis philosophi oratio in ipsum scripta*. Sed de dialogo Platonis intellexit Lilius; et recte quidem: eo solum nomine culpandus, quod errantem ducem secutus est. Jam vero, cum illud exploratum sit de Olympiade LXXXII., quis dubitet quin Ionem Æschylus anteierit ætate? siquidem obiit fere septuagenarius, triennio prius ad minimum quam Ion ad studium tragicum se applicaret. Præterea, narrat Ion (apud Athenæum[y]) convenisse se in insula Chio Sophoclem poetam, cum prætor factus navigaret in Lesbum: et (apud Plutarchum[z]) memorat solitum esse Periclem jactare se magnificentissime, quod Samios vicisset. Ea vero gesta sunt Olymp. LXXXIV. IV. a morte Æschyli annis quindecim. Didascaliæ veteres in Argumento *Hippolyti*: *Ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ δράματος ὑπόκειται ἐν Θήβαις* (imo *Τροιζῆνι*)· [*ἐδιδάχθη*] *ἐπὶ Ἀμείνονος ἄρχοντος, Ὀλυμπιάδι πζ̄, ἔτει δ̄. Πρῶτος Εὐριπίδης, δεύτερος Ἰοφῶν, τρίτος Ἴων*. Itaque Olymp. LXXXVII. IV. Ion fabula certavit annis septem et viginti posteaquam Æschylus mortuus est. Denique hæc sodes vide ex Aristophanis *Pace*:[a]

Θε. Οὐκ ἦν ἄρ' οὐδ' ἃ λέγουσι περὶ[b] τὸν ἀέρα,
Ὡς ἀστέρες γινόμεθ', ὅταν τις ἀποθάνῃ;

[x In *Socr.* p. 94. ed. Meib., ubi .... *ἀποδημῆσαι*.—D.]
[y l. xiii. c. lxxxi. t. v. p. 185. ed. Schw.—D.]
[z In *Pericl.*—Plut. *Opp.* t. i. p. 646. ed. Reisk.—D.]
[a v. 798. ed. Bekk.—D.] [b *κατὰ*. Aristoph. edd. omnes.—D.]

Τρ. Μάλιστα. Θε. Καὶ τίς ἐστιν ἀστὴρ νῦν ἐκεῖ;
Τρ. Ἴων ὁ Χῖος.

Scholiastes[c] notat Ionem jam mortem obiisse: *Ὅτι ὁ μὲν Ἴων ἤδη τέθνηκε δῆλον.* addo, etiam eodem anno quo acta est ea fabula, XIII. videlicet belli Peloponnesiaci, Olymp. XC. II., uti constat ex ipsa comœdia, ubi Trygæus sic Pacem alloquitur:

Μὰ Δί', ἀλλ' ἀπόφηνον ὅλην σαυτὴν
Γενναιοπρεπῶς τοῖσιν ἐρασταῖς
Ἡμῖν, οἵ σου τρυχόμεθ' ἤδη
Τρία καὶ δέκ' ἔτη.[d]

Jam nusquam habet Malelas, quo abdat illud putidum et inhonestum caput. Tantum abest ut Ion Æschylo natu fuerit grandior; ut superstes ei fuerit annos solidos XXXVII. Nunc tempus est ut de Ionis scriptis fidem liberemus. Et profecto non immerito propter multiplicem doctrinam a Callimacho laudatus est Ion. *Καὶ Καλλίμαχος*, ait Suidas,[e] *ἐν χωλιάμβοις μέμνηται αὐτοῦ, ὅτι πολλὰ ἔγραψεν.* Nam ut poemata prius recenseamus; deinde quæ oratione prosa composuit: *Melica* Ionis laudantur et *Dithyrambica*. Schol. Aristophanis,[f] et Suidas: *Ἴων διθυράμβων . . . . καὶ μελῶν ποιητής.* Harpocration:[g] *Ἔγραψε δὲ μέλη πολλά.* Et dithyrambo quidem vicit, cum Atheniensibus viritim Chii cadum distribuit. Ex melicis carminibus extat odæ principium, *Ἀοῖον ἀμεροφοίταν Ἀστέρα μείναμεν, Ἀελίου λευκοπτέρυγα πρόδρομον.* Sic lege apud Scholiastem et Suidam: male in utroque *ἀεροφοίταν*, et in altero *λευκῇ πτέρυγι.*[h]

[c Ad v. 803. ed. Bekk., ubi *τεθνήκει.*—D.]
[d v. 952. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[e In *Διθυραμβοδ.*—D.]
[f Ad *Pac.* v. 801. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[g In v. *Ἴων.*—D.]
[h *μείνωμεν* (vulgo *μείνομεν*). Schol. ad *Pac.* v. 801. ed. Bekk.—*μῆνα μέν.* Suid. in *Διθυραμβοδ.*—

Ἀοῖον ἠεροφοίταν
Ἀστέρα μείνωμεν,
Ἀελίου, κ. τ. λ.

Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 529.—*Ἀστέρ' ὑμνέομεν.* Burgesius in Præf. ad Eurip. *Troad.* p. xiii.—D.]

Pæanes, Hymni, Scolia sive carmina convivalia. Schol. Aristoph. *Elegiaca.* Idem et Suidas. Ex elegis non paucos versus adducit Athenæus: ut lib. xi. c. 3.[i] *Καὶ Ἴων δ' ὁ Χῖός φησι,*

Χαιρέτω ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς, σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε.
Ἡμῖν δὲ κρητῆρ' οἰνοχόοι θέραπες
Κιρνάντων προχύταισιν ἐν ἀργυρέοις· ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς
Οἶνον ἔχων χειρῶν νιζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος·

et quæ sequuntur: ubi Casaubonum nequicquam æstuantem videas, ut eliciat ex istis sententiam commodam; nam prius correctionis indigent, quam a quoquam intelligi possint. Non longe aberrabimus a scopo, si sic legerimus:

——————— *ὁ δ' ἕκαστος*
Οἶνον ἔχων χειροῖν ἰζέτω εἰς ἔδαφος.[j]

Comœdiæ, ut Comici Schol. *Comœdia,* ut Suidas. *Epigrammata.* Idem Schol. et *Anthologia Epigram.* lib. iii. c. 26.[k]

Ἴωνος εἰς Εὐριπίδην.

Χαῖρε μελαμπέπλοις, Εὐριπίδη, ἐν γυάλοισι
Πιερίας τὸν ἀεὶ νυκτὸς ἔχων θάλαμον·
Ἴσθι δ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς ὤν, ὅτι σοι κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται,
Ἴσον Ὁμηρείαις ἀενάοις χάρισιν.

Sed omnino falsa est et ementita inscriptio: quam ratio temporum refutat et rejicit. Mirificum vero poetam Ionem, qui Euripidem mortuum epigrammate celebraverit, ipse jam annos tredecim extinctus. Decessit Ion[l] Olymp. xc. ii.

[i c. viii. t. iv. p. 197. ed. Schw.—D.]

[j Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 554.—

——— *ὁ δὲ Χρύσης* (*Chryses,* sacerdotis nomen.)
Οἶνον ἔχων χειροῖν νιζ. κ. τ. λ.
Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 538.

De hoc loco videas Schw. *Animadv. in Athen.* t. vi. p. 26. et omnino t. viii. p. 491.—D.]

[k *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br. ed. Jacobs.* t. iv. p. 230.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal.* &c. t. i. p. 319.—D.]

[l Vide Clintonum, *Fasti Hellen. from the* LV. *to the* CXXIV. *Ol.* pp. 73, 81, 83, 85. *sec. ed.*—D.]

anno belli Peloponnesiaci XIII. Euripides autem et Sophocles ejus belli XXVI. anno, Olymp. XCIII. III. uti constat ex Aristophanis *Ranis*, quæ actæ sunt eo anno Dionysiis *τοῖς κατ' ἀγροὺς*· ut alia argumenta mittam ab eruditis viris occupata. Itaque loco *Ἴωνος* scribendum est fortassis *Ἰωάννου*, vel *Βίωνος* vel *Δίωνος*, ut cuique libitum fuerit. *Tragœdiæ* numero xii., ut alii volunt xxx., ut alii xl. *Σχολ.*[m] et Suidas.[n] Tituli quidem undecim a veteribus Grammaticis adhuc servantur. *ΑΓΑΜΕΜΝΩΝ*. Idem *Σχολ.* et Athenæus. Hesychius: *Πεδανῷ ὕπνῳ, ἢ πεδανῷ κούφῳ, Ἴων Ἀγαμέμνονι, τινὲς δὲ οὐ βεβαίῳ*: leg. *ἠπεδανῷ, κούφῳ*. *ΑΛΚΜΗΝΗ*. Hesych. Pollux x. 23.: *Ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἴωνος Ἀλκμήνῃ, ὃ εἰς τὴν τῆς τροφῆς παρασκευὴν ἦν, θυλακίσκη ὠνόμασται*. Repone ex Cod. Vossiano, *ὁ εἰς τὴν τῆς τροφῆς παρασκευὴν θυλακίσκος ὠνόμασται*.[o] *ΑΡΓΕΙΟΙ*. Hesych. *ΜΕΓΑ ΔΡΑΜΑ*. Pollux x. 45.[p] Hesych. in *Ὀνοταζομένη*, et *Μελάγχετον, μεγάλῳ δράματι ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἷον ἀκμάζουσαν*. Lego: *Μελαγχαίταν, Ἴων Μεγάλῳ Δράματι*.[q] Homines *ἀκμάζοντες* ætate florentes capillitio fere nigro sunt, provecti canescunt. Sed verbum id inversum est ab Ione, et ad alia tralatum, quæ sunt annis et viribus integris: quasi diceretur exempli gratia *ἵππος μελαγχαίτας, equus florenti ætate, juvencus*. *ΦΡΟΥΡΟΙ*. Schol. Aristoph. Hesych. Athenæus. *ΦΟΙΝΙΞ*. Julius Pollux:[r] *Ἴων δὲ ἐν Φοίνικι σαφέστερον· Ἀλλ' ὦ θυρετρῶν τῶνδε κωμῆται θεοί*. Enarrator Comici ad *Ranas*:[s] *Τοῦτο τοῦ Ἴωνός ἐστιν ἐκ Φοινίκης*

[m Ad Arist. *Pac.* v. 801. ed. Bekk.—D.] [n In v. *Ἴων*.—D.]

[o "Vera sine dubio scriptura, quam Codices nostri MSS. conservarunt: *θύλακος, σάγη*· quid itaque Bentleius, vir doctissimus, *ad Millium*, p. 54. [ed. Ox.] *Repone ex Cod. Vossiano: ὁ εἰς τὴν τῆς τροφῆς παρασκευὴν θυλακίσκος ὠνόμασται*· aliud egit profecto homo sagacissimus; sic enim exaratum in Codice Vossiano, ut nos expressimus in textu, nisi fallunt Excerpta [*ὃ εἰς τὴν τῆς τροφῆς παρασκευὴν θύλακος, σάγη ὠνόμασται*]. Sed restat scrupulus in *ἦν*, quod delevi: duplicem in antiquis libris fuisse lectionem existimo, aut eam, quam reddidi e C. V., aut hanc, *ὃς ἐ. τ. τ. τρ. π. ἦν θ.*" Hemst. ad *Poll.* p. 1264.—D.]

[p p. 1367. ed. Hemst.—D.]

[q "Forsan *Μελαγχίτων*', *Ἴων*, &c. et . . . . *αἰάζουσαν*." Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iv. p. 97.—D.]

[r p. 1001. ed. Hemst.—D.] [s v. 705. ed. Bekk.—D.]

ἢ καὶ Οἰνέως· Εἰ δ' ἐγὼ ὀρθὸς ἰδεῖν βίον ἀνέρος, πολιῆται. Repone ex certissima conjectura ἐκ Φοίνικος ἢ Καινέως· et versus iste heroicus est, non alienus a tragœdia:

Εἰ δ' ἐγὼ ὀρθὸς ἰδεῖν βίον ἀνέρος, ὦ πολιῆται.

sic Athenæus lib. iii. et iv.[t] Ἴων ἐν Φοίνικι ἢ Καινεῖ. Itaque est ΦΟΙΝΙΞ Η ΚΑΙΝΕΥΣ et ΦΟΙΝΙΞ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ: vide Hesychium in Τιμαλφής. Athenæus fine lib. iv.[u] Ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ Φοίνικι ὁ . . Ἴων φησίν· Ἔκτυπον ἄγων βαρὺν αὐλὸν τρέχοντι ῥυθμῷ, οὕτω λέγων τῷ Φρυγίῳ. Non de nihilo est quod Codd. MSS[i] constanter exhibent τρέχοντα· ad quorum indicium sic legerim:

—— ἐκτύπουν, ἄγων βαρὺν
Αὐλὸν, τρέχοντα ῥυθμόν·

ut in Euripidis *Rheso*:[v]

Πολλοῖσι σὺν κώδωσιν ἐκτύπει φόβον.

ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ. Hesychius: Ἀϊδροὶ, ἀΐδριες, ἰῶν Τεύκρῳ † Ἀϊδροφῶντι, ἀϊδρίων ἀναιρετικῷ: scribe Ἴων, et illud alterum Hesychii peccatum est scutica dignum. Quicunque fuerit *interfector* iste *stultorum*, homo sane metuendus, sine dubio trucidasset Hesychium, si occasionem hanc nactus fuisset. Vera scriptura est Ἀνδρειφόντῃ, ἀνδρῶν ἀναιρετικῷ, ex Homerico isto:

Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντῃ.[w]

Ἀμφιβώτης, περιβόητος· Ἴων Τεύκρῳ: lego περιβοήτου.[x] Βώσας, βεβωμένος Herodot. inde ἀμφίβωτος. Idem alibi, Ἀμφιρῶτις, περιβόητος. Iterum tibi, mi Hesychi, a stulticida illo cavendum est; nam cur non ego par pari referam, et barbariam tuam ulciscar nunc demum nato vocabulo? ΟΜΦΑΛΗ. Schol. Aristoph. Harpocration. Hesychius:

[t l. iii. c. xli. t. i. p. 357. et l. iv. c. lxxxiv. t. ii. p. 196. ed. Schw.—D.]

[u t. ii. p. 197. ed. Schw., quem vide in *Animadv.* t. ii. p. 684.—D.]

[v v. 304. ed. Matt.—D.]

[w *Il.* vii. 166. Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 554.—D.]

[x Vide Schowium ad *Hesych. Suppl.* p. 72.—D.]

Ἐῤῥωπίζομεν, Ἴων Ὀμφάλῃ. τινὲς ῥωπίζειν ἀπέδοσαν τὸ ἀτεχνεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀμαθεύεσθαι,[y] (pro *ἀμαθαίνειν*) *κακῶς. Ἔστι γὰρ ῥῶπος ὁ λεπτὸς καὶ ποικίλος φόρτος, καὶ βέβαιος,*[z] *καὶ τὰ ἔσω τῶν ῥωπῶν πλέγματα κανᾶ καὶ σεῖστρα κυρίως.* Lego *ἀτεχνιτεύεσθαι·* et *Ἔστι γὰρ ῥῶπος ὁ λεπτὸς καὶ ποικίλος φόρτος, καὶ γέλγαι, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ῥωπῶν πλέγματα κανᾶ καὶ σῆστρα κυρίως.* Quanto hæc meliora quam illa Palmerii![a] Hesychius alibi: *Ἐριωπιζόμην, ἢ τεχνητευόμην, ἢ σύμμικτα σχήματα εἶχον.* Iterum a librariis deceptus est. Sana lectio est: *Ἐῤῥωπίζομεν, ἠτεχνιτεύομεν, ἢ σύμμικτα χρώματα εἴχομεν.*[b] *Etymolog. Magnum:* *Ἐῤῥωπίζομεν, εὔμικτα καὶ συμπεφορημένα ἐποιοῦμεν·* quod ferri quidem potest; sed emendatius fortasse profertur ab Eustathio:[c] *Φέρεται δὲ καὶ ῥῆμα τὸ ῥωπίζειν, ὃ δηλοῖ τὸ σύμμικτα καὶ συμπεφυρμένα ποιεῖν.* Quod ad *βέβαιος*[d] attinet, terminatio *ΟΣ* in libris MSS. minuto apice signatur: illa vero non oppido dissimilia *γέλγαι* vel *γέλγια* et *βέβαι.*[e] Aliis est potius *γέλγη* numero singulari. Eustathius:[f] *Ῥῶπος, . . λεπτὸς καὶ ἀτελὴς* (leg. *εὐτελὴς*) *φόρτος, ὡς δὲ Αἴλιος Διονύσιος λέγει, καὶ ποικίλος· γέλγην δέ, φησιν, αὐτὸν ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοί.* Hesych.: *Γέλγη, ὁ ῥῶπος, καὶ βάμματα, καὶ ἄτρακτοι καὶ κτένες.* Photius Patriarcha: *Ῥῶπος,*

[y Vulgo *ἀματεύεσθαι.*—D.]

[z Vulgo *ὁ λεπτὸς χόρτος καὶ ποικίλος καὶ βέβαιος.*—D.]

[a Totum locum sic legit Palmerius: *Ἐῤῥωπ. Ἴων Ὀμφ. τινὲς ῥωπ. ἀπέδ. τὸ ἀτεχνεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀμαθευέσθαι, κακῶς· ἐστὶ γὰρ ῥωπὸς, ὁ λεπτὸς φόρτος, καὶ ποικίλος, καὶ βαιὸς, καὶ τὰ ἔξω τῶν ῥωπῶν πλέγματα, κανᾶ καὶ σήγιστρα κυρίως.*—D.]

[b " *Χρώματα εἴχομεν* emendat magnus Bentleius, ut scil. respondeat *τῷ Ἐῤῥωπίζομεν.* Non video tamen, salvo V. Cl. honore, cur posterius *εἴχομεν* admittamus, et omnia in 1. pers. plur. efferamus. Certe minima mutatione prætulerim hanc lectionem: *Ἐῤῥωπιζόμην. ἠτεχνιτευόμην, ἢ σύμμ. χρώματα εἶχον.* Nisi quis ostenderit, in Ionis *Ὀμφάλῃ* fuisse *Ἐῤῥωπίζομεν,* ut infra scribitur." Albertius ad *Hesych.* t. i. p. 1435.—"*Ἐῤῥωπιζόμην, ἠτεχνητευόμην, ἢ σύμμικτα χρώματα* vel *χρήματα, εἶχον.*" Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 496. —D.]

[c Ad *Il.* N. p. 927. ed. Rom.—D.]

[d "*καὶ οὐ βέβαιος,* vel *καὶ ἀβέβαιος,* vel potius *καὶ βαιός.*" Toupius, *Emend. in Hesych.* t. iii. p. 383. et p. 448.—D.]

[e Confer nostrum in Epist. ad Bernard., *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 554.—D.]

[f Ad *Il.* N. p. 927. ed. Rom.—D.]

μηδενὸς[f] *ἄξιον. Ῥῶπος καὶ γέλγη, ὁ ποικίλος, λεπτὸς φόρτος.* Jam *σῆστρα* certissima emendatio: ea sunt *canistra, virgultis* aut *juncis contexta.* Hesychius: *Σῆστρα, κόσκινα ἢ κύμβαλα·* duo verba confundit *σῆστρα* et *σεῖστρα,* quorum hoc *ἀπὸ τοῦ σείειν* formatur, illud *ἀπὸ τοῦ σήθειν.* Achæus vetustus tragicus docuit *Omphalen* satyricam: quo de genere persuasum prorsus habeo etiam hanc Ionis fuisse. Hercules servivit Omphalæ, Genio et Veneri assidue litavit: jussus et inter ancillarum greges pensa carpere, sicubi duro et indocto pollice fila rumpebat, e vestigio hominis caput sandalium commitigabat.[g] Nihil hic triste neque tragicum: ludus jocusque omnia. Favent huic sententiæ fragmenta, quotquot supersunt; quæ nihil nisi convivia, comessationes, et symphonias pollicentur. Hesych. *Μεσόμφαλοι, φιάλαι. Etym. Πῖθι Πακτώλου ῥοάς.* Pollux:[h] *Καὶ τὴν μέλαιναν στίμμιν ὀμματογράφον.* Athenæus:

———Οἶνος οὐκ ἔνι
Ἐν τῷ σκύφει·[i]

et

Ἐνιαυσίαν γὰρ δεῖ με τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγειν·[j]

et

Λυδός τε μάγαδις αὐλὸς ἡγείσθω βοῆς·[k]

et lib. xiv.[l]

Ἀλλ' εἶα, Λυδαὶ ψάλτριαι, παλαιθέτων
Ὕμνων ἀοιδοί, τὸν ξένον κοσμήσατε.

[f *μηθενὸς*, et mox *καὶ λεπτὸς*. Phot. ed. Pors.—D.]

[g Terent. *Eun.* v. 7. 4. respicit noster.—D.]

[h l. v. c. xvi. p. 535. ed. Hemst.—D.]

[i lib. xi. c. xcix. t. iv. p. 350. ed. Schw.—D.]

[j lib. vi. c. lxxiii. t. ii. p. 491. ed. Schw.—*ἄγειν* tacite Bentleius pro vulgata *λέγειν.—ἄγειν.* Porsonus, *Advers.* p. 88.—"Lege, *τὴν ἑορτὴν δεῖ μ' ἄγειν.*" Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—*ὁρτὴν ἄγειν* edidit Dindorfius, *Athen.* t. i. p. 561.—D.]

[k lib. xiv. c. xxxv. t. v. p. 300. ed. Schw.—D.]

[l (Edd. *Epist. ad Mill.* "lib. x.")—c. xxxvi. t. v. p. 302. ed. Schw.—"Qu. an legendum, *τὸν ξένον κοιμήσατε.* quamvis ferri possit vulgata." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]

Ita lege, non *Ἀλλ' αἱ Λυδαὶ*, quod versus recusat. Et eodem libro:[m] *Ἴων δ' ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ ἐμφανίσας τὴν Ἡρακλέους ἀδδηφαγίαν ἐπιφέρει·*

——— Ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς εὐφημίας
Κατέπινε καὶ τὰ κᾶλα καὶ τοὺς ἄνθρακας.

Casaubonus corrigere conatus est, *τῆς εὐφαγίας*. Nollem factum. Neque enim quisquam ita locutus est; neque, si fuerit locutus, eo magis conveniret huic loco; quia syllaba secunda foret brevis. Nihil aptius excogitari potest *τῆς βουλιμίας*· adeo quadrant omnia, similitudo, mensura, sententia. Libet illud afferre cum probationis tum boni ominis causa,

Ἔξω τὰν βούλιμον, ἔσω τὰν πλουθυγίειαν.[n]

Atque hæc quidem de *Omphale* scripseram, cum Strabo mihi ad manum non esset. Posteaquam copia facta est eum adeundi, delectatus sum ejus suffragio confirmari sententiam meam. Verba sunt lib. i.[o] de insulis, quæ continenti quondam adhærentes, postea interfuso mari avulsæ sunt. *Ἴων δὲ περὶ τῆς Εὐβοίας φησὶν ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ Σατυρεῖς·*

Εὐβοΐδα μὲν γῆν λεπτὸς Εὐρίπου κλύδων
Βοιωτίας ἐχώρισ' ἀκτῆς, ἐκτεμὼν[p]
Πρὸς Κρῆτα πορθμόν.

Locum hunc, ait Casaubonus, *depravatum esse monere possum: emendare non possum sine ope codicum.* Ego vero nullis adjutus codicibus, nisi tamen in integrum restituero,

[[m] lib. x. c. i. t. iv. p. 4. ed. Schw., ubi *ἐμφανίσας αὐτοῦ* [scil. Herc.] *τὴν ἀδηφ. κ. τ. λ.*—Vulgatam *εὐφημίας* defendit Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 535.; et non temere mutandam judicat Schw., quem vide in *Animadv.* t. v. p. 292. et t. viii. p. 478.—D.]

[[n] Vide Plutarch. *Conviv. Disput.* lib. vi. quæst. 8.—*Mor.* t. iii. p. 586. ed. Wyttenb.—Erasmi *Adag.* p. 1436. ed. 1606.—D.]

[[o] p. 88. ed. Falc.—D.]

[[p] *ἐκτεμὼν* est e Casauboni emendatione pro vulgata *ἐκτέμνων*.—D.]

nihil deprecor, ne dentatis criticorum chartis et canina eloquentia conscindar. Lego autem sic:

Εὐβοΐδα μὲν γῆν λεπτὸς Εὐρίπου κλύδων
Βοιωτίας ἐχώρισ', ἀκτὴν ἐκτεμὼν
Προβλῆτα πορθμῷ.

Homerus, *Od. E.*[q]

Ἀλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλῆτες ἔσαν, σπιλάδες τε, πάγοι τε·

et *Hymno in Bacchum*:[r]

——Ὡς ἐφάνη παρὰ θῖν' ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο,
Ἀκτῇ ἐπὶ προβλῆτι.

Nec minus recte illud *πορθμῷ*. Pomp. Mela:[s] "Sicilia . . . . aliquando continens, et agro Brutio adnexa, post *freto* maris Siculi *abscissa* est." Idem Casaubonus legit *Ὀμφάλῃ Σατυρικῇ*, vel *Σατυρικῷ* videlicet *δράματι*· nam Ionis *Omphalam*, ut Achæi, satyricam fuisse putat. Postea tamen oblitus est hujus loci, cum aureolum illum libellum *De Satyrica* composuit. Sic enim narrat p. 186. *Scripserat et Ion Chius poeta tragicus Omphalam: sed id drama fuisse satyricum nusquam lego.* Tu revoca in memoriam quæ scripsimus supra paullo in hac Epistola, et sine cunctatione lege *ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ Σατύροις*. Illud etiam notandum, cum numero singulari conjungi *Σατύρους*· cujus rei exemplum tunc non habuimus. Sic Lycophronis *Μενέδημον Σατύρους* laudant Athenæus et Laërtius. Jamque etiam in memoriam redeo luculenti loci apud Galenum, *Comm.* i. ad vi. *Ἐπιδημιῶν*·[t] ubi Sophocles citatur in *Σαλαμῖνι Σατύροις*. Is ita se habet. *Νυνὶ δὲ ἀρκέσει τοῖς γραμματικοῖς ἀκολουθήσαντα, κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνων διάταξιν εἰπεῖν τι περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν πέμφιγα σημαινομένων. Δοκεῖ μὲν*

[q v. 405.—D.]
[r v. 2.—D.]
[s ii. 7.—D.]
[t Galeni *Opp.* t. v. p. 454, 455. ed. Basil.—D.]

γὰρ αὐτὴν[u] ἐπὶ τῆς πνοῆς Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Κολχοῖς[v] λέγειν· Ἀπῆξε πέμφιξιν οὐ πέλας φόρου. (lege

Ἀπῆξε πέμφιξ Ἰονίου πέλας πόρου.

Sic Æschylus *Prometheo*:[w]

Χρόνον δὲ τὸν μέλλοντα πόντιος μυχὸς,
Σαφῶς ἐπίστασ', Ἰόνιος κληθήσεται,
Τῆς σῆς πορείας μνῆμα τοῖς πᾶσι βροτοῖς.

Apollonius Rhodius lib. iv.[x] loquens de Colchis:

Τῷ καὶ ὑπέφθη τούς γε, βαλὼν ὑπὲρ αὐχένα γαίης,
Κόλπον ἔσω πόντοιο πανέσχατον Ἰονίοιο.

Vel[y] ad hunc modum, si id minus placet, æque commoda mutatione;

Ἀπῆξε πέμφιξ ἐξ ἕω σελασφόρου.)[z]

Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν Σαλαμίνῃ Σατύροις· Καὶ τάχ' ἂν κεραύνια πέμφιξι βροντῆς καὶ δυσοσμίας λάβοι. (lege . . . καὶ τάχ' ἂν Κεραύνια Πέμφιξι βροντῆς καὶ δυσοσμίας βάλοι.)[a] Αἰσχύλος δὲ ἐν Προμηθεῖ Δεσμώτῃ (imo vero Λυομένῳ)·[b]

Εὐθεῖαν ἕρπε τήνδε·[c] καὶ πρώτιστα μὲν

[u αὐτῆς. ibid.—D.] [v Scribendum Κολχίσι.—D.]
[w v. 864. ed. Blomf., ubi κεκλήσεται.—D.]
[x v. 307.—D.]
[y Hæc ("Vel ad . . . . σελασφόρου"), quæ in prioribus editt. paulo superius leguntur, nunc demum in suum locum reduxi, Bentleio jubente in Corrigendis ad ed. Oxon.—D.]
[z Ἀπῆξε πέμφιξ ὡς ἰκνοῦ σελασφόρου. Hermannus (*De Æsch. Prom. Sol. Diss.—Opusc.* t. iv. p. 276.), de ignivomis tauris verba intelligens.—D.]
[a ——— καὶ τάχ' ἂν κεραυνίᾳ
πέμφιγι βροντῆς καὶ δυσοσμίαν λάβοι,
Hermannus, ibid.—"Malim, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς . . . . . καὶ τάχ' ἂν κεραυνία Πέμφιξ σε βροντῆς καὶ δυσοσμίας βάλοι. κεραυνία πέμφιξ βροντῆς, ut *etesia flabra aquilonum*, etc. supra, p. 37." [supra, p. 295.] Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]
[b Dubitat Hermannus; vide *Diss.* sup. cit.—D.]
[c ἑρπετὴν δέ. Gal. ibid.—D.]

Βορεάδας ἥξεις πρὸς πνοὰς, ἵν' εὐλαβοῦ[c]
Βρόμον καταιγίζοντα, μὴ σ' ἀναρπάσῃ
Δυσχειμέρῳ πέμφιγι ξυστρέψας[d] *ἄφνω.*

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκτίνων αὐτῶν δοκεῖ χρῆσθαι τῷ τῆς πέμφιγος ὀνόματι Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Κολχοῖς[e] *κατὰ τάδε τὰ ἔπη· Κἂν ἐθαύμασα τῇδε σκοπῶν πέμφιγα χρυσέαν ἰδών.* (lege . . . . *Κἀπεθαύμασα Τηλέσκοπον πέμφιγα χρυσείαν ἰδών.*)[f] *οὕτω καὶ Αἰσχύλος· Ἐξαντιαίας*[g] *οὔτε πέμφιξ ἡλίου προσδέρκεται, οὔτ' ἄστερον στόμα λητῶας κόρης.* (lege *Αἰσχύλος ἐν Ξαντρίαις·*

Ἃς οὔτε πέμφιξ ἡλίου προσδέρκεται,
Οὔτ' ἀστερωπὸν ὄμμα Λητῷας κόρης.[h]

Ea fabula citatur in Catalogo Dramatum et Scholiis *Eumenidum*. Pollux x. c. 26.[i] *Τὰς μέντοι λαμπάδας καὶ κάμακας εἴρηκεν ἐξαντρίας Αἰσχύλος.* MS. codex Is. Vossii habet *ἐν ξαντρίαις·* ut et antea viri docti ex conjectura emendarunt. Porro Æschylus in his versibus se ipse imitatus est: nam hæc habet in *Prometheo Vincto*[j] de Græis sive Phorcidibus:

Μονόδοντες, ἃς οὔθ' ἥλιος προσδέρκεται
Ἀκτῖσιν, οὔθ' ἡ νύκτερος μήνη ποτέ.)

Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ῥαγίτιδος (lege *ῥανίδος*[k]) *ὁ αὐτός φησιν ἐν Προμηθεῖ·*

Ἐξευλαβοῦ δὲ, μή σε προσβάλλῃ στόμα
Πέμφιξ· πικρὰ γὰρ, κοὐ διὰ ζωῆς ἀτμοί.

[c πνοαισιν, εὐλαβοῦ. Gal. ibid.—D.] [d τρέψας. Gal. ibid.—D.]
[e Scribendum Κολχίσι.—D.]
[f κἂν ἐθαύμασας et χρυσέαν. Hermannus (ibid.), in ceteris Bentleium secutus.—D.]
[g ἐξ ἀντιαίας. Gal. ibid.—D.]
[h Consentit Hermannus, ibid. — Οὔτ' ἀστέρων, οὔτ' ὄμμα Λ. κ. corrigit Blomfieldius ad Æsch. *Prom.* 821.—D.]
[i p. 1295. ed. Hemst.—D.] [j v. 821. ed. Blomf.—D.]
[k Et sic Hermannus (ibid.), qui mox προσβάλῃ.—" Recte Bentleius ῥανίδος (ρα"τιδος). Deinde Ibyci locus Sophocleo ex Salmoneo præponendus. Hoc

Καὶ ἐν Πενθεῖ· Μηδ' αἵματος πέμφιγα πρὸς πέδῳ βάλῃς. Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ νέφους δοκεῖ τετάχθαι κατὰ τόδε τὸ ἔπος ἐν Σαλαμήνῃ Σατύροις παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ· Πέμφιγι πᾶσαν ὀψιαγέλων πυρός. (scrib. *Πέμφιγι πᾶσαν ὄψιν ἀγγέλῳ πυρός.*[l]) *καὶ παρ' Ἰβύκῳ· Πυκινὰς πέμφιγας πιόμενοι. λέλεκται δὲ οὗτος ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ κατά τινα παραβολὴν ἐπιχειμαζομένων* (lege *ἐπὶ χειμ.*) *εἰρημένην. διὸ καὶ τῶν προγνωστικῶν οἱ πλεῖστοι ἐπὶ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς ὄμβρους σταγόνων εἰρῆσθαί φασι τὰς πέμφιγας. ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος ὧδε· Μὴ διὰ πεμφίγων * ἐνάγουσιν ἔα.*[m] *ὁ δὲ Εὐφορίων οὕτως· Εἶπε δ' ἄνθη πέμφιγες ἐπιτρύζουσι θανόντα.* Versus est hexametrus, *Εἰ πεδαναὶ*, vel *Ἠπεδαναὶ πέμφιγες ἐπιτρύζουσι θανόντα.* i. e. *murmure suo quasi lamentari videntur.* Possis etiam legere *ἐπικλύζουσι.*[n] Quod ad *Σαλαμῖνα Σατύρους* attinet, cujus gratia cætera emendavimus; nemo me adduxerit, ut verbum mendo esse vacuum existimem. Æschylus quidem fecit *Σαλαμῖνα*, sive *Σαλαμινίας*· Sophocleæ fabulæ, quæ eo titulo inscripta sit, nemo alius meminit. Ausim pro certo dicere lectionem rectam esse *Σαλμωνεῖ Σατύροις*. Hesychius bis: *Σοφοκλῆς Σαλμωνεῖ.*

Quatuor hic invectus equis, et lampada quassans,
Per Graiûm populos mediæque per Elidis urbem
Ibat ovans, divûmque sibi poscebat honorem,
Demens! qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen
Ære et cornipedum pulsu simularat equorum.[o]

Hactenus quidem argumentum est satyris aptum, et conveniens ad hilarem et festum diem. Huc quoque fragmenta

certum; et ita extra dubium ponitur eximia illa emendatio, *ὄψιν ἀγγέλῳ πυρός.* Quæ enim sequuntur, sunt istorum verborum explicationes. In Callimacheis forsan legendum *ἔω*—*In clouds brings on the day.* In Euphorione malim ΗΠΕΔΑΝΟΙ. Qu. *θανόντι?*" Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]

[l *πέμφιγι πλήσας ὄψιν ἀγγέλῳ πυρός.* Hermannus in *Diss.* sup. cit. p. 277. —D.]

[m *ἐναγίσματα.* Hermannus, ibid.—D.]

[n *ἠπεδανὸν πέμ. ἐπιτρ. θανόντα.* Id. ibid.—D.]

[o Virg. *Æn.* vi. 587.—D.]

illa videntur pertinere; quæ verba sunt cujuspiam qui facete et urbane irridet jocularem illam simiam Tonantis:

——— *Καὶ τάχ' ἂν Κεραύνια*
Πέμφιξι βροντῆς καὶ δυσοσμίας βάλοι.

——— *Forsan et petet Ceraunia*
Odore tetro et vi corusca fulminis.

Et illud alterum:

Πέμφιγι πᾶσαν ὄψιν ἀγγέλῳ πυρός.

Nimbo ora velans *nuncio tonitrui.*

Atque hucusque Sophocles in eo dramate processit: nam quæ sequuntur plane tragica sunt, et lamentabili carmine deploranda.

At pater omnipotens densa inter nubila telum
Contorsit, (non ille faces, nec fumea tædis
Lumina) præcipitemque immani turbine adegit.[p]

Et hæc quidem conjectura probabili nituntur: sed extra controversiam rem statuit Athenæus lib. xi.[q] *Καλεῖται δὲ μάνης καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ*[r] *κοττάβου ἐφεστηκὸς, ἀφ' οὗ* (leg. *ἐφ' οὗ*) *τὰς λάταγας ἐν παιδιᾷ ἔπεμπον· ὅπερ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Σαλμωνεῖ χάλκειον ἔφη κάρα, λέγων οὕτως·*

Τὰ δ' ἐστὶ κνισμὸς καὶ φιλημάτων ψόφος,
Τῷ καλλικοτταβοῦντι νικητήρια
Τίθημι, καὶ βαλόντι χάλκειον κάρα.

Jam si potes, dubita, an drama satyricum fuerit necne. Profecto qui potest animum inducere, ut versus proximos autumet in tragœdia posse dici, auctor ego sum, ut prius quid sit tragœdia, quid satyri discat, quam de rebus aliquantum a vulgari notitia remotis sententiam ferat.

Undecima Ionis fabula *ΕΥΡΥΤΙΔΑΙ*. Athenæus lib. xi.[s] Hesych. *Ἰήϊος . . . . θρῆνον σημαίνει, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς Τρωΐλῳ*

[p Virg. *Æn.* vi. 592.—D.]
[q c. lxxv. t. iv. p. 306. ed. Schw.—D.]
[r *ἐπὶ τοῦ.* ibid.—D.]
[s c. xc. t. iv. p. 336. ed. Schw.—D.]

καὶ Ἴων Ἐρυτίδαις: lege *Εὐρυτίδαις*. *Ἀθίκτορας, ἀνεπάφους παρθένους, . . . οἷον Εὐρύτιδες*. Pulchre fecisse sibi visus est, qui[t] emendavit, *οἷον Εὐριπίδης*. Tu vero meo periculo repone *Ἀθίκτους κόρας, ἀνεπάφους παρθένους, Ἴων Εὐρυτίδαις*.[u] Eurytidæ autem, ne quis forte nesciat, sunt Euryti Œchaliensis filii, quos Hercules occidit. Habes tragœdiæ argumentum. Non prætermittendus est insignis locus apud Schol. Soph. ad *Trachinias*.[v] *Διαφωνεῖται ὁ τῶν Εὐρυτιδῶν ἀριθμός. Ἡσίοδος μὲν γὰρ* (in *Ἡοίαις*, ut puto, vel *Ἡρωικῇ Γενεαλογίᾳ*) *τέσσαράς φησιν ἐξ Εὐρύτου καὶ Ἀντιόχης παῖδας, οὕτως·*

Ἡ δ' ὑποκυσσαμένη καλλίζωνος Στρατονίκη
Εὔρυτον ἐν μεγάροισιν ἐγείνατο φίλτατον υἱόν.
Τοῦ δ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντο Δηΐων τε, Κλύτιός τε,
Τοξεύς τ' ἀντίθεος, ἠδ' Ἴφιτος ὄζος Ἄρηος.
Τοὺς δὲ μέθ' ὁπλοτάτην τέκετο ξανθὴν Ἰόλειαν
Ἀντιόχη κρείουσα, παλαιὸν γένος Αὐβολίδαο.

Κρεόφιλος δὲ δύο· Ἀριστοκράτης δὲ τρεῖς, Τοξέα, Κλύτιον, Δηΐονα. Satis jam pernosti, qui sint Ionis Eurytidæ. Sed haud plene satisfactum esset promisso nostro, si versus eos dimitteremus ex manibus, et mendum teterrimum silentio dissimularemus. Principio legendum *Ἀντιόπη*. Schol. Apollonii:[w] *Κλύτιος καὶ Ἴφιτος—οἱ τῆς Ἀντιόπης παῖδες*. Hyginus:[x] *Clytius, et Iphitus, Euryti et Antiopes Pylonis filiæ filius*. Quæ quasi manu nos ducunt ad cætera corrigenda. Jam enim Hygini auctoritate scribo *Πύλωνος* pro *παλαιὸν γένος*· atque adeo, ut pompam et procœmia missa faciam, versum hunc integrum præstabo, sicut ab Hesiodo profectus est,

Ἀντιόπη κρείουσα Πύλωνος Ναυβολίδαο.

Nam cedo mihi unum, qui Auboli vel Aubolidæ meminit.

[t scil. Sopingius.—D.]
[u Confer nostrum in Addendis.—D.] [v v. 264. ed. Erf.—D.]
[w i. 87.—D.]
[x *Fab.* xiv. p. 42. (*Auct. Myth.*) ed. Van Stav.—D.]

Naubolus vero nemini ignotus esse possit, qui labris primoribus gustavit literas humaniores. Apollonius Rhodius:[y]

> *Τῷ δ' ἔπι δὴ θείοιο κίεν Δαναοῖο γενέθλη*
> *Ναύπλιος· ἦ γὰρ ἔην Κλυτονήου Ναυβολίδαο,*
> *Ναύβολος αὖ Λέρνου.*

Conveniunt ætas, locus: ut, quanquam de hac re nullum verbum faciant alii scriptores, nihil tamen impediat, quo minus Pylon Nauboli filius esse potuerit. Denique pro *Κρεόφιλος* lege *Κρεώφυλος*, qui poema composuit *Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσιν*: ad quod respexit Scholiastes. De Creophylo consulantur Appuleius, Porphyrius, Strabo, Sextus Empiricus, Suidas, scriptor *Certaminis Hesiodi et Homeri*, Plato *Πολιτειῶν* x. Photius in Lexico MS. *Κρεώφυλος*·[z] *Πολιτείας ῑ. ὁ γὰρ Κρεώφυλος, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἴσως ὁ Ὁμήρου*[a] *ἑταῖρος· τοῦτόν τινες καὶ διδάσκαλον Ὁμήρου λέγουσι γεγονέναι, καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ ποίημα Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσις. ἀρχαῖος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ, νεώτερος δὲ ἱκανῶς Ὁμήρου.* Pausanias *Messenicis*:[b] *Θεσσαλοὶ δὲ καὶ Εὐβοεῖς . . . . λέγουσιν, οἱ μὲν ὡς τὸ Εὐρύτιον . . . . πόλις τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἦν, καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο Οἰχαλία· τῷ δὲ Εὐβοέων λόγῳ Κρεώφυλος ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ πεποίηκεν ὁμολογοῦντα.* *Heracleam* hanc diversam esse totam ab *Οἰχαλίας ἁλώσει* sententia est Ger. Vossii. Ægidius vero Menagius asseveranter affirmat pro *ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ* scribendum esse *ἐν Οἰχαλίᾳ*. Demiror equidem viros excellentes ingenio et doctrina morbo minime desperato medicinam non reperisse: quæ, nisi me omnia fallunt, hæc est. *Τῷ δὲ Εὐβοέων λόγῳ Κρεώφυλος Ἡρακλέα πεποίηκεν ὁμολογοῦντα. Eubœensium autem sententiæ Creophylus Herculem induxit convenienter loquentem.* Enimvero pars magna illius poematis fuit Hercules; ut propemodum jam illud audire mihi videar:

> *Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε βίη Ἡρακληείη.*

[y i. 133.—D.]
[a τοῦ Ὁμ. ibid.—D.]
[z Κρεόφυλος. ed. Pors.—D.]
[b p. 225. ed. Bekk.—D.]

Similis locutio est in istis, quæ occasione alia supra[c] adduximus: *Ἐν τοῖς Κρησὶν Εὐριπίδης Ἴκαρον μονῳδοῦντα ἐποίησεν*, et *Ἐν ταῖς Κρήσσαις Ἀερόπην εἰσήγαγε πορνεύουσαν*· neque opus est, ut plures testes excitemus. Sunt qui *Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσιν* ad Homerum referunt; sicut auctor est Callimachus[d] apud Strabonem et Sextum:

Τοῦ Σαμίου πόνος εἰμὶ, δόμῳ ποτὲ θεῖον Ὅμηρον
Δεξαμένου· κλαίω δ' Εὔρυτον ὅσσ' ἔπαθε,
Καὶ ξανθὴν Ἰόλειαν. Ὁμήρειον δὲ καλεῦμαι
Γράμμα· Κρεωφύλῳ, Ζεῦ φίλε, τοῦτο μέγα.

Suidas in *Ὅμηρος· Ἀναφέρεται δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ποιήματα, Ἀμαζονία, Ἰλιὰς μικρὰ, Νόστοι, Ἐπικιχλίδες, Ἠθιέπακτος ἤτοι Ἴαμβοι, ... Σικελίας ἅλωσις.* Sed pro *Σικελίας* sine ulla dubitatione legendum est *Οἰχαλίας*. Addam illud quoque, quod, si bene Millium meum novi, prætermissum esse graviter tulisses: nimirum *Ἠθιέπακτος* esse verbum nihili, et aliquanto inferius sic scribi, *Ἑπταπάκτιος. Καὶ Ἑπταπάκτιον*, ait, *καὶ Ἐπικιχλίδας . . . . ἐποίησεν.* Et prima quidem specie ea conjectura vera videbatur, *ἑπτὰ* scilicet *Ἐπίγονοι*. Memineram enim et septem esse Epigonos, et ad Homericorum poematum numerum adscribi. Herodotus iv.[e] *Ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδῳ μέν ἐστι περὶ Ὑπερβορέων εἰρημένα, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ ἐν Ἐπιγόνοισιν, εἰ δὴ τῷ ὄντι γε Ὅμηρος ταῦτα τὰ ἔπεα ἐποίησε.* Sed repudiavi continuo illam sententiam, ubi animadverti *Epigonos* esse *ἔπη, καὶ οὐκ ἰάμβους*, non senarios, sed hexametros. Scriptor *Certaminis Homeri et Hesiodi*:[f] *Ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος ἀποτυχὼν τῆς νίκης, περιερχόμενος ἔλεγε τὰ ποιήματα· πρῶτον μὲν τὴν Θηβαΐδα ἔπη ζ̄, ἧς ἡ ἀρχὴ,*

Ἄργος ἄειδε, θεὰ, πολυδίψιον· ἔνθαβ ἄνακτες.

[c p. 270.—D.]

[d Call. *Ep.* vi.—"Apud Sextum legitur, Κρεωφύλου πόν. εἰ., δό. πο. θεῖ. ἀοιδόν, quod magis placet." Bentleius, *Not. in Call.*—Κρεωφ. et Ὅμηρον edidit Blomf. —D.]

[e c. 32.—D.] [f p. 14. ed. 1573.—D.] [g ἔνθεν. ibid.—D.]

Εἶτα ἐπειγομένου (lege non dubitanter *Ἐπιγόνους*) *ἔπη ζ̄, ὧν ἡ ἀρχὴ,*

Νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα, Μοῦσαι.

Alii et *Thebaidem* et *Epigonos* attribuunt Antimacho Colophonio. De illa quidem res est vulgaris: de his testem habeo Scholiastem Aristoph. ad *Pacem*:[h] *Παι. Νῦν αὖθ' ὁπλοτέρων ἀνδρῶν ἀρχώμεθα . . . . Σχολ. ἀρχὴ τῶν Ἐπιγόνων Ἀντιμάχου.* Verum extra omnem controversiam rem posuit Joannes Tzetzes, qui utriusque scripti simul mentionem facit, in *Iliade interpretata allegorice*, quæ nondum edita est:

Τρία καὶ δέκα γέγραφε μνημόσυνον βιβλία,
Μαργίτην τε, καὶ Αἶγά τε, καὶ τῶν Μυῶν τὴν μάχην,
Τὴν Ἐπιγόνων μάχην τε γράφει, καὶ Θηβαΐδα,
Τὴν Οἰχαλίαν, Κέρκωπας, εἰς τοὺς Θεούς τε Ὕμνους,
Καὶ τοὺς Ἑπτὰ ἐπάκτιον, καὶ τὰς Ἐπικιγκλίδας,
Καὶ Ἐπιγράμματα πολλὰ, σὺν Νυμφικοῖς τοῖς Ὕμνοις,
Καὶ τὴν Ὀδύσσειαν αὐτὴν μετὰ τῆς Ἰλιάδος.

In his etiam *Œchaliam* habes: sed aliud exemplar non *τοὺς* habet, verum *τὴν Ἑπτὰ ἐπάκτιον*. Aut ego plane desipio, aut legendum est

Καὶ τὴν Ἑπταεπάκτιον,[i] *καὶ τὰς Ἐπικιχλίδας·*

postremam enim vocem non Suidas tantum, sed et Herodotus ita exhibet, et Athenæus lib. ii. et xiv. Quin etiam apud Suidam illud *Ἑπταπάκτιον* ad hoc exemplum corrigen-

[h v. 1236. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[i "Scribe *τὴν Ἑπτάπεκτον*, et hominem [Tzetzen] ride, qui ex uno titulo duos [*τοὺς Ἑπτ.*, et *Αἶγα* in v. 2.] confinxerit, et verba conjungenda disjunxerit. . . . . Adcurate satis Proclus in vita Homeri apud Leon. Allatium: *Γέγραφε* . . . . . ΤΗΝ ΤΕ ΕΠΤΑΠΕΚΤΟΝ ΑΙΓΑ." Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 580.—"Allatii emendationem *ἑπτάπεκτον αἶγα, villosam, hirsutam, ita ut vel septies tonderi possit*, satis firmavit Toupius." Heynius ad Procli *Chrestomath.*, ad calcem Hephæst. p. 470. ed. Gaisf.—D.]

dum est: et pro *Ἠθιέπακτος*[j] scribendum videtur *ἡ ζεπάκτιος*, i. e. *ἡ ἑπταεπάκτιος*· nam *ζ* notat *ἑπτά*. Sic apud Hesychium: *Ἐννεωρὸς, θέτης*· lege *θετης*, i. e. *ἐνναέτης*· quia *θ* significat *ἐννέα*· et verbo uno interjecto, *Ἐννηὴς, σώφρων, ἀληθὴς, ἀγαθὸς, πατρῶος*. Librarii, ut compendium operæ faciant, *πηρ* scribunt pro *πατὴρ*, et pro *πατρῶος πρῶος*, quod in hoc loco depravatum est ex *πρᾷος*· vide Hes. in *Ἐνηής*. Cæterum de notatione *τῆς Ἑπταεπακτίου*, ut et illud attingam, facillimum est multa comminisci: proxime tamen, opinor, ad verum accedent, qui Homerum putaverint in opusculo illo lusisse de hominibus quibusdam numero septem, qui *ἐπ' ἀκτῆς in litore* cibo vel somno curabant corpora, vel aliud quid jocosi et ridiculi faciebant. Homerus ipse in *Certamine cum Hesiodo*:[k] *Ἀνδράσι ληϊστῆρσιν ἐπ' ἀκτῆς δόρπον ἑλέσθαι*· et *Odyss.* V.[l] *Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς εὗρε καθήμενον*. Et Herodotus in *Vita Homeri*:[m] *Καὶ οὕτως ἀναλαβόντες αὐτὸν ἀνήχθησαν, καὶ ἴσχουσιν ἐπ' ἀκτῆς· οἱ μὲν δὴ ἁλιεῖς πρὸς ἔργον ἐτράπησαν, ὁ δὲ Ὅμηρος τὴν νύκτα ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ κατέμεινεν*· et aliquanto inferius:[n] *Καὶ ἀναχθεὶς μετά τινων ἐγχωρίων ἀπηνέχθη εἰς τὴν Ἴον· καὶ ὡρμίσθησαν οὐ κατὰ πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς*. Atque hanc vel illam rem verisimile est argumentum et occasionem poemati dedisse. Venio ad ea, quæ *oratione prosa* Ion composuit. Nam in eo genere libros edidisse testis est Plutarchus *De Fortuna Romanorum*:[o] *Ἴων μὲν οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν τοῖς δίχα μέτρου καὶ καταλογάδην αὐτῷ γεγραμμένοις φησὶν, ἀνομοιότατον πρᾶγμα τῇ σοφίᾳ τὴν τύχην οὖσαν, ὁμοιοτάτων πραγμάτων γίνεσθαι δημιουργόν*. et Suidas in *Διθυρ.* *Ἔγραψε δὲ κωμῳδίαν*[p] *καὶ ἐπιγράμματα καταλογάδην καὶ Πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον*. Portus vertit barbare: *Et epigrammata oratione soluta*. Libenter vero videre vellem nobilia

[j "Uterque [Suidæ] locus depravatus est. . . . . Scribendum proculdubio *Ἑπτάπεκτος*." Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 578.—D.]

[k p. 6. ed. 1573.—D.]

[l v. 151.—D.]

[m p. 19. ed. 1752.—D.]

[n p. 34. ibid.—D.]

[o *Mor.* t. ii. p. 206. ed. Wyttenb.—D.]

[p *κωμῳδίας*. ed. Gaisf.—D.]

illa epigrammata pedestri sermone facta. Vah! adeone exaruerat penitus benigna illa vena ingenii? et extincta erat prorsus ea mentis inflammatio, sine qua nemo fit bonus poeta? Quid? unane et generosum Ariusium in cellis evanuerat, quo memorant Ionem bene libenter plerumque esse usum? enimvero verissimum esse comperit, quod olim dixerat Epicharmus;[p]

Οὐκ ἔντι διθύραμβος, ὄκχ' ὕδωρ πίῃς.

Sed bene est, quod commoda mutatione propulsare possumus hoc dedecus a summo poeta.[q] Sic enim Suidam emendo. *Ἔγραψε δὲ κ. καὶ ἐπιγράμματα, καὶ καταλογάδην ΠΡΕΣΒΕΥΤΙΚΟΝ λεγόμενον.* Schol. Aristophanis:[r] *Ἔγραψε . . . . . σκολιὰ, . . . καὶ ἐλεγεῖα, καὶ καταλογάδην τὸν Πρεσβευτικὸν λεγόμενον, ὃν νόθον ἀξιοῦσί τινες εἶναι, οὐχὶ αὐτοῦ.*[s] Idem Scholiastes:[t] *Φαίνεται δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ Κτίσις, καὶ Κοσμολογικὸς, καὶ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ, καὶ ἄλλα τινά.* Depravatum hunc locum sic corrige: *Φαίνεται δὲ αὐτοῦ ΧΙΟΥ ΚΤΙΣΙΣ. Etymologicon Magnum: Λόγχας μερίδας Ἴωνες λέγουσιν. Ἴων ἐν Κίου κτήσει· Ἐκ τῆς Τέω λόγχης λόγχας ποιεῖν.*[u] Certissime legendum est *Ἴων ἐν Χίου Κτίσει, Ion in Originibus Chii.* Videlicet ipse fuit Chius

[p In *Philoctete*, apud *Athen.* l. xiv. c. xxiv. t. v. p. 276. ed. Schw., ubi *Οὐκ ἔστι, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]

[q "Nimirum *καταλογάδην*, non secus ac Romanorum *pedestris*, non tantum *prosam orationem*, sed *prosæ* etiam *simile* significat; Hesychius *καταλογάδην· πεζῇ, ἢ τὰ πεζῷ λόγῳ γραφόμενα.* De Ione Plutarchus de Fortun. Rom. p. 316. D.: *Ἴων μὲν οὖν, ὁ ποιητὴς, ἐν τοῖς δίχα Μέτρου καὶ καταλογάδην αὐτῷ γεγραμμένοις.* Scholiastes Aristoph. Pace v. 835. Ionis *πρεσβευτικόν·* Suidas autem epigrammata etiam ejus *καταλογάδην* scripta fuisse, confirmat v. *Διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι.* quamquam Bentleius ad Mill. p. 64. [ed. Oxon.] Suidæ lectionem sollicitet. qua de re, cum Presbeutici fragmenta nulla supersint, judicare vix licet." Santenius ad *Terent. Maur.* p. 172., ubi plura.—Ad Suidæ locum ne verbum quidem Gaisfordius doctissimus, qui vulgatam exhibuit.—D.]

[r Ad *Pac.* v. 801. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[s *ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναί τινες καὶ οὐχὶ αὐτοῦ.* ibid.—D.]

[t ibid., ubi *Φέρεται δὲ αὐτ. κ. τ. λ.*—D.]

[u "In Etymol. dele *λόγχας*, vel potius *λόγχης*. *Agros dividere.*" Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]

natione, et insula Teos Chio propinqua est, non Cio. Athenæus libro x.[v] *Περὶ δὲ ταύτης τῆς κράσεως Ἴων ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν τῷ περὶ Χίου φησὶν, ὅτι εὑρὼν ὁ μάντις Παλαμήδης ἐμαντεύσατο πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι τοῖς Ἕλλησι πίνουσι τρεῖς πρὸς ἕνα κυάθους.* Unum idemque est scriptum; sed rideo eos, qui hæc perinde ediderunt, quasi essent versus iambici, non oratio soluta: de mendo autem, quo contaminatus est locus, nihil suspicati sunt. Quorsum enim pertinet illud *εὑρών*? Quid *reperit?* quod pueri clamitant se in faba reperisse? Ego vero ausim asseverare sic a doctissimo grammaticorum fuisse scriptum: *Ὅτι ὁ οἰωνόμαντις Παλαμήδης*, &c.[w] Pausanias in *Achaicis* Ionis quædam citat, ex hoc *Originum* libro, ut quidem conjicio: non tamen usquequaque servavit verba auctoris. Ion enim, ut hominem Chium facere par erat, in prosaicis scriptis Ionica dialecto est usus. Constat hoc ex superiore loco *Etymologici*, et Harpocrationis alio, et fragmento alius operis, quod *ΕΠΙΔΗΜΙΑΙ* inscribitur. Athenæus xiii.[x] *Ἴων οὖν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Ἐπιδημίαις γράφει οὕτως· Σοφοκλεῖ τῷ ποιητῇ ἐν Χίῳ συνήντησα, ὅτε ἔπλει εἰς Λέσβον στρατηγὸς*, et quæ sequuntur. Quanquam enim magnam partem perturbata ibi sunt verba, et in communem sermonem immutata; non obscura tamen restant vestigia Ionismi: ut *κάρτα δοκέον, ἀφαιρέοντα,*[y] *ἀσσοτέρα, ἔπρησσε, ῥεκτήριος, ἐνωπήθη τῇ ἐπιῤῥαπίσει.*[z] Is. Casaubonus ad locum: *Ἐνωπεῖσθαι*, ait, *si ita scripsit auctor, nove usurpavit pro δυσωπεῖσθαι.* Nempe,

[v c. xxviii. t. iv. p. 59. ed. Schw.—D.]

[w *ὅτι ὁ ἀλευρόμαντις* Παλ. Toupius, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 543.—" Neque Bentleii neque Toupii emendationem probare possum. Mallem legere *Ὅτι* ETPOTN *ὁ μάντις.* Constructio erit, *Ἐμαντεύσατο πλοῦν ἔσεσθαι* ETPOTN, *Navigationem fore secundam.*" Tyrwhittus, *Not. in Toup.* &c. t. iv. p. 426.—" Si quid esset mutandum, probarem *οὔριον*, ad *πλοῦν* relatum, quod proposuit Jacobs in Animadv. in Eurip. Trag. pag. 141. Sed in librorum scriptura omnino adquiescendum arbitror." Schw. (*Animadv. in Athen.* t. v. p. 387.), qui de Tyrwhitti conjectura tacet.—D.]

[x c. lxxxi. t. v. p. 185. ed. Schw.—D.]

[y *ἀφαιρετέοντα.* t. v. p. 187. ed. Schw.—D.]

[z Vide Toupium, *Emend. in Suid.* (*Ep. Crit.*) t. ii. p. 541. et t. iii. p. 69.—D.]

quod mireris, existimavit verba Athenæi esse, non Ionis. Atqui *ἐνωπεῖσθαι* vox nihili est: *ἐνωπήθη* vero Ionica, et a *νωπεῖσθαι* formata. Hesychius: *Ἐνώπηται, τεταπείνωται.* Antiquum obtinuit, cum depravatum illud protulit ex aliorum fide, nihil ipse suspicans vel sollicitus. Lege vero integre *νενώπηται,* loco mutili istius. Idem alibi: *Νενώνηται, τεταπείνωται, καταπέπληκται.* Lege hic quoque *νενώπηται.* Patriarcha Photius in Lexico MS.: *Νενώπηται, καταπέπληκται καὶ κατεστύγνακεν.* Rectissime quidem Photius, ut ex hoc Ionis loco perspicuum est. Quid ego de Athenæi interprete dicam, qui *Ἐπιδημίας Peregrinationes* interpretatur, perinde ac si *Ἀποδημίαι* inscriberentur? Verum alibi quoque *Ἐπιδημιῶν* meminit Athenæus, ut l. iii.[a] *Τῶν δὲ χημῶν μνημονεύει Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ἐν Ἐπιδημίαις.* Intellige *De adventibus clarorum virorum in Chium,* sive *De iis qui in Chio insula commorati sunt.* Similiter ac Polemo librum edidit, *De Eratosthenis adventu ad Athenas.* Enarrator Comici ad *Aves*:[b] *Πολέμων ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ τῆς Ἀθήνησιν Ἐρατοσθένους ἐπιδημίας.* Ex *Epidemiis* petita videntur vel *Ὑπομνήμασι,* quæ laudat Plutarchus in *Vita Periclis;* et *Cimonis*[c] etiam non longe a principio: *Ἦν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἰδέαν οὐ μεμπτὸς, ὥς φησιν Ἴων ὁ ποιητὴς, ἀλλὰ μέγας, οὔλῃ καὶ πολλῇ τριχὶ κομῶν τὴν κεφαλήν.* Quæ sine dubio est oratio pedestris, et magis Plutarchi verba, ut suspicor, quam Ionis. Magnus tamen Grotius[d] ad iambos tragicos redigere conatus est:

Τὴν γὰρ ἰδέαν οὐ μεμπτὸς, ἀλλ' ἔην[e] *μέγας,*
Οὔλῃ τε πολλῇ τε τριχὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν κομῶν.

Hæccine autem oratio, tam leves numeri tragicum quid spirant, et cothurno dignum? Haud vidi magis. Quid illud ibidem,[f] bene multis interjectis? *Ὁ δ' Ἴων ἀπομνημονεύει καὶ τὸν λόγον, ᾧ μάλιστα τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐκίνησε (Κίμων), παρακαλῶν μήτε τὴν Ἑλλάδα χωλὴν, μήτε τὴν πόλιν ἑτερό-*

[a c. xliv. t. i. p. 362. ed. Schw.—D.]
[b v. 11. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[c Plut. *Opp.* t. iii. p. 182. ed. Reisk.—D.]
[d *Exc.* p. 451.—D.]
[e *ἦεν.* ibid.—D.]
[f Plut. *Opp.* t. iii. p. 209. ed. Reisk.—D.]

ζυγα περιϊδεῖν γεγενημένην. Grotius[e] perinde hæc accepit, tanquam si ex tragœdiæ choro desumpta fuissent:

Μήτε τὴν Ἑλλάδα χωλὴν,
Μήτε τὴν πόλιν ἑτερόζυγα
Περιϊδεῖν γεγενημένην.

Nos pusilli homunculi vix possumus carere venia, cum etiam maximi heroes labuntur identidem et hallucinantur turpissime. Scripsit Ion et *Philosophica*, ut *ΚΟΣΜΟΛΟΓΙΚΟΝ*· Schol. Aristoph.[f] et, si Suidæ[g] credimus, *De Meteoris*, et *Compositas* sive ornatas *orationes*: *Οὗτος*, ait, *ἔγραψε περὶ Μετεώρων καὶ Συνθέτους λόγους.* Quo nihil ineptius vel falsius dici potuit. Imo neque magis contumeliose, siquis *ἐπαριστέρως* et perverse interpretari velit de sermonibus ad fraudem et fallaciam compositis, secundum illud Æschyli in *Prometheo*:[h]

——— *Μηδέ μ' οἰκτίσας*
Ξύνθαλπε μύθοις ψευδέσι, νόσημα γὰρ
Αἴσχιστον εἶναί φημι συνθέτους λόγους.

Error autem ortus est ex perperam intellecto loco Scholiastæ Aristoph. ad *Pacem*.[i] Poetæ scilicet dithyrambici verborum amant tralationes *ἐκ τῶν μετεώρων*, ex astris, nubibus, aliisque quæ in sublimi fiunt; libenter etiam vocabulis sesquipedalibus et coagmentatis utuntur. Demetrius *περὶ Ἑρμηνείας*·[j] *Ληπτέον δὲ καὶ σύνθετα ὀνόματα, οὐ τὰ διθυραμβικῶς συγκείμενα, οἷον Θεοπεράτους*[k] *πλάνας, οὐδὲ Ἄστρων δορύπυρον στρατὸν, ἀλλ' ἐοικότα τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας συγκειμένοις.* Et Horatii illud: "Seu per audaces *nova* dithyrambos Verba devolvit."[l] Ipse Suidas alibi:[m] *Διθυραμβοδιδάσκαλοι περὶ τῶν μετεώρων καὶ τῶν νεφελῶν λέγουσι πολλὰ, καὶ συνθέτους δὲ λέξεις ἐποίουν, καὶ ἔλεγον ἐνδιαεριανερινηχέτους*·[n] *οἷος ἦν Ἴων ὁ Χῖος ποιητής.* Omnino

[e *Exc.* p. 449.—D.]
[f Ad *Pac.* v. 801. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[g In *Ἴων*.—D.]
[h v. 705. ed. Blomf.—D.]
[i vv. 795, 797. ed. Bekk.—D.]
[j p. 42. ed. Schn.—D.]
[k *θεοτεράτους*. ed. Schn., cujus notam adeas, p. 142.—D.]
[l *Carm.* iv. 2.—D.]
[m In *Διθυραμβοδιδ.*—D.]
[n Vulgo *ἐνδιαεριαιερινηχέτους*.—D.]

vide Aristophanem in *Pace*,[l] ejusque enarratorem. Itaque jam manifesto compertum et deprehensum est Suidæ mendacium. *ΤΡΙΑΓΜΟΝ*. Locus est illustris apud Harpocrationem, quem ex usu fuerit integrum describere. *Ἴων. Ἰσοκράτης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ἀντιδόσεως. Ἴωνος τοῦ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητοῦ μνημονεύοι ἂν νῦν ὁ ῥήτωρ* (atqui nec in ea oratione, nec in reliquis quæ nunc extant, est ulla mentio Ionis, quod sciam), *ὃς ἦν Χῖος μὲν γένος, υἱὸς δὲ Ὀρθομένους, ἐπίκλησιν δὲ Ξούθου. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ μέλη πολλὰ καὶ τραγῳδίας, καὶ φιλόσοφόν τι σύγγραμμα τὸν Τριαγμὸν ἐπιγραφόμενον, ὅπερ Καλλίμαχος ἀντιλέγεσθαί φησιν, ὡς Ἐπιγένους. Ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ πληθυντικῶς ἐπιγράφεται Τριαγμοί, καθὰ Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος καὶ Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ Νικαεὺς ἀναγράφουσι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τάδε· Ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου πάντα τρία, καὶ πλέον τοῦδε, πλέον ἐλάσσων τούτων τριῶν ἑνὸς, ἑκάστου ἀρετὴ τριὰς, σύνεσις καὶ κράτος καὶ τύχη.*[m] Male ista percepit interpres, qui ita vertit: *velut ex eo Dem. Sc. et Ap. N. ista commemorant*. Ego vero sic interpungendum esse censeo: *καθὰ Δ. ὁ Σ. καὶ Α. ὁ Νικαεύς. Ἀναγράφουσι δὲ*, nimirum aut Eratosthenes in *Descriptionibus temporum*, aut potius Callimachus in *Tabulis omnis generis librorum*. Nam *ἀναγράφειν* est *in tabulas recensere et mittere, in catalogum referre*. Ipse Harpocration alibi: *Εὔηνος.... Δύο ἀναγράφουσιν Εὐήνους ἐλεγείων ποιητὰς, ὁμωνύμους ἀλλήλοις· καθάπερ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ Χρονογραφιῶν*. Athenæus xv.[n] *Καὶ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἀνέγραψε Καλλίμαχος ἐν τῇ τῶν Ῥητορικῶν Ἀναγραφῇ, in Catalogo librorum Rhetoricorum*. Hunc autem morem in *Tabulis* istis tenebat Callimachus, ut cujusque libri prima verba describeret; sicut hic fit apud Harpocrationem. Unum tantummodo exemplum afferam, quia pridem hæc ab eruditis sunt occupata. Athen. lib. vi.[o] *Τοῦ Χαιρεφῶντος καὶ σύγγραμμα ἀναγράφει Καλ-*

[l vv. 795 sqq. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[m "Malim, λόγου παντὸς .... ἔλασσον τούτων (omisso τριῶν), vel τῶν τριῶν. In fine lege τρία pro τριάς. Pro ἐν τούτῳ [αὐτῷ] qu. ἐκ τούτων." Dobræus, *Advers.* t. ii. p. 365.—D.]

[n c. ix. t. v. p. 438. ed. Schw., ubi Ῥητ. Ἀπογραφῇ.—D.]

[o c. xliii. t. ii. p. 435. ed. Schw.—D.

λίμαχος ἐν τῷ τῶν παντοδαπῶν συγγραμμάτων Πίνακι,[p] γράφων οὕτως· Δεῖπνα ὅσοι ἔγραψαν. Χαιρεφῶν Κυρηβίωνι. εἶθ' ἑξῆς τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑπέθηκεν· Ἐπειδή μοι πολλάκις ἐπέστειλας. στίχων τοε. Καὶ ὁ Κυρηβίων δὲ ὅτι παράσιτος, προείρηται. Ita locus iste corrigendus est. Chærephon parasitus ad ὁμότεχνον suum Cyrebionem epistolam misit, in qua describit cœnam quandam sine dubio opipare apparatam. Χαιρεφῶν Κυρηβίωνι· Ἐπειδή μοι πολλάκις ἐπέστειλας, &c. Quod si vulgatam lectionem servare velis, Χαιρεφῶν, Κυρηβίων· jam non Chærephontis verba forent, quæ Athenæi sententia est; sed Cyrebionis. Illud autem exordium Τριαγμοῦ nondum a viris doctis emendatum esse demiror; qui, etsi dissimulant et mussant, juxta id intelligunt, ac si in Ovidii *Getica* incidissent. Me auctore sic lege: Ἀρχὴ δέ μοι τοῦ λόγου Πάντα τρία, καὶ οὔτε πλέον οὔτε ἔλασσον τούτων τριῶν Ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἀρετὴ, τριάς· σύνεσις, κράτος, καὶ τύχη.[q] Ubi singula quidem verba sunt communia: qui tamen ex ipso charactere et forma dicendi non sentit Ionismum, nihil sentit. De *Epigene* vero, quo me vertam nescio, ita res et hinc et inde magnam habet difficultatem. Nam ecce tibi Suidas, qui non Epigenem, sed Orpheum auctorem faciat Τριαγμῶν. (Ὀρφεὺς,) inquit, ἔγραψε Τριαγμοὺς,[r] λέγεται[s] δὲ εἶναι Ἴωνος τοῦ τραγικοῦ. Cumque Epigenem video enarrationem Orphei fecisse, Clementi memoratam Στρωμ. i.[t] Ἐπιγένης ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς εἰς Ὀρφέα ποιήσεως Κέρκωπος εἶναι λέγει τοῦ Πυθαγορείου τὴν εἰς Ἅδου Κατάβασιν καὶ τὸν Ἱερὸν λόγον·—(Proclus tamen *In Timæum* lib. v.[u] ipsum Pythagoram hujus auctorem laudat. Ἃ γὰρ, ait, Ὀρφεὺς δι' ἀποῤῥήτων λόγων μυστικῶς παραδέδωκε, ταῦτα Πυθαγόρας ἐξέμαθεν, ὀργιασθεὶς ἐν Λειβήθροις τοῖς Θρα-

[p ἐν τῷ τῶν παντοδαπῶν Πίνακι correxit Bentleius, *Callim. Frag.* p. 471. ed. Ern., probante Schw.—D.]

[q ἀρχὴ ἥδε μοι τοῦ λόγου. πάντα τρία καὶ πλέον οὐδὲ ἔλασσον. τούτων τῶν τριῶν ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἀρετὴ τριὰς, σύνεσις καὶ κράτος καὶ τύχη. Harpocr. p. 103. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[r vulgo Τριασμούς.—D.]

[s vulgo λέγονται.—D.]

[t p. 397. ed. Pott.—D.]

[u p. 291. ed. Basil.—D.]

κίοις Ἀγλαοφάμω τελεστὰ μεταδιδόντος, ἣν περὶ Θεῶν Ὀρφεὺς σοφίαν παρὰ Καλλιόπης τῆς μητέρος ἐπινύσθη· ταῦτα γάρ φησιν ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐν τῷ Ἱερῷ λόγῳ. Unde constat *Ἱερὸν*, ut alia scripta Pythagorica, dialecto Dorica fuisse compositum) :—et v.[t] *Ἐπιγένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς Ὀρφέως ποιήσεως τὰ ἰδιάζοντα παρ' Ὀρφεῖ ἐκτιθέμενός φησι, Κερκίσι καμπυλόχρωσι, τοῖς ἀρότροις μηνυέσθαι,* &c.: cum hæc, inquam, lego, propemodum adducor in eam opinionem, ut Harpocration hoc exemplo scripserit: *ὅπερ Καλλίμαχος ἀντιλέγεσθαί φησιν, ὡς καὶ Ἐπιγένης.* E diverso ubi illud venit in mentem, Orphei ipsius et Pythagoræ quoque mentionem factam esse in illis *Τριαγμοῖς*, continuo sententiam eam abjicio, et manifesti erroris Suidam arguo. Clemens *Στρ.* i.[u] *Ἴων δὲ ὁ Χῖος ἐν τοῖς Τριαγμοῖς καὶ Πυθαγόραν εἰς Ὀρφέα ἀνενεγκεῖν τινα ἱστορεῖ·* et Diogenes Laërt.[v] *Ἴων δὲ ὁ Χῖος ἐν τοῖς Τριαγμοῖς φησὶν αὐτὸν (τὸν Πυθαγόραν) ἔνια ποιήσαντα ἀνενεγκεῖν εἰς Ὀρφέα.* Itaque constat Suidam alterutrius verba perperam cepisse: et præstabilius est receptam Harpocrationis lectionem sartam et tectam tueri. Nempe ut suspicor libri Epigenis cum Ionis scriptis conjuncti ferebantur: is enim commentarium fecerat in Ionis tragœdias; quod scias ex Athenæo lib. xi. cap. v.:[w] ut nihil miri sit, si librariorum, qui omnia perturbant et miscent, alii tanquam Ionis *Τριαγμοὺς* inscripserint, alii ut Epigenis.

Pag. 174 [181]. *Καὶ μετὰ Μίνωα Αὐλέας τραγικοὺς χοροὺς δραμάτων συνεγράψατο.* Permirum fortasse videatur, Milli doctissime, tenebrionem illum Auleam pro Æschylo a Joanne dici. Quid autem admirationis habet, cum in memoria quis teneat tot alias hallucinationes hominis? Etiam p. 74 citatur *Αὐλέας ὁ σοφώτατος* de Endymione, quem in monte Cariæ Luna consopivit, ut eum dormientem oscularetur. Suspicor et hic quoque significari Æschylum, qui in fabula *Caribus* sive *Europa* non potuit non eam historiam attingere. Illud autem quam longe abest a vero, quod Æschylum

[t p. 675. ed. Pott.—D.] [u p. 397. ed. Pott.—D.]
[v In *Pyth.* p. 493. ed. Meib.—D.]
[w c. xxxiv. t. iv. p. 232. ed. Schw.—D.]

narrat primum instituisse choros tragicos! E diverso partes chori, antea quam Æschylus tragœdias faceret, erant altero tanto longiores, quam post. Sed ea res nisi pluribus verbis explicari non potest: tota fere scenæ ratio et historia est illustranda; complures auctorum loci qua corrigendi, qua novo modo interpretandi; multi errores amovendi, jam ipsa vetustate cani et venerabiles. Nemo enim unus ex cohorte eruditorum, qui in eo argumento tantopere laborarunt, scire adhuc potuit, quid Thespis, quid Æschylus et Sophocles inventis addiderunt. Itaque tam odiosa disceptatione patienter carere possis in præsentia: imo vereor ut citra fastidium epistolam perlegas etiam absque ista concertatione nimium loquacem. Me quidem et moræ pertæsum est et ineptiarum.

P. 214. *Στησίχορος καὶ Βακχυλίδης, οἳ ἦσαν ὀρχήσεως εὑρεταὶ, καὶ ποιηταί.* Quid narras? nimirum nostra nos opinio fefellit, qui credidimus te Antiochiæ esse natum. Siquidem auctor est Lucianus Antiochenses de saltatoribus optime omnium judicare potuisse: te autem cum aliarum omnium, tum hujus artis imperitissimum videmus. Rogo te, homo hominum ignavissime, nunquamne Sacras Scripturas lectitasti? nonne ibi frequens saltationis mentio diu diuque, antequam Stesichorus nasceretur? quid? ne Homerum quidem per transennam aspexisti? jam ergo eum audias licet:

Ὀρχηστὺς, μολπή τε, τάπερ τ' ἀναθήματα δαιτός.[x]

Ἄλλῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμήϊα ἔργα,
Ἄλλῳ δ' ὀρχηστὺν, ἑτέρῳ κίθαριν καὶ ἀοιδήν.[y]

Scio tamen, quid in fraudem te impulit; nempe nomen Stesichori, tanquam si primus *ἐστήσατο χορούς*· et poemata quædam Bacchylidis, quæ *Ὑπορχήματα* inscripta sunt, et a Stobæo citantur, et Athenæo lib. xiv.[z] *Ἡ δ' ὑπορχηματική ἐστιν, ἐν ᾗ ᾄδων ὁ χορὸς ὀρχεῖται· φησὶ γοῦν ὁ Βακχυλίδης·*

[x *Od.* i. 152., ubi Μολπή τ' ὀρχηστύς τε· τὰ γάρ τ' ἀν. δαιτ.—D.]
[y *Il.* xiii. 730.—D.]
[z c. xxx. t. v. p. 288. ed. Schw.—D.]

Οὐχ ἕδρας ἔργον, οὐδ' ἀμβολᾶς. Locus aliquanto integrior est apud Dionysium Halicarnassensem.[a] *Οὐχ ἕδρας ἔργον, οὐδ' ἀμβολᾶς, ἀλλὰ χρυσαίγιδος Ἰτωνίας χρὴ παρ' εὐδαίδαλον ναὸν ἐλθόντας ἁβρόν τι δεῖξαι.* Omnes cretici præter unum pedem, qui in pæonem solutus est; adeo ut, cum hunc locum lego, coram oculis videre videar *ὑπορχουμένους* et subsultantes. Nec tamen princeps et inventor hyporchematum Bacchylides; sed, ut quibusdam videtur, Pindarus; ut alii volunt, Xenodamus. Vide Clementem, Athenæum, et Plutarchum *περὶ Μουσικῆς*.

P. 133. *Γλαῦκος, ἰσχυρὸς, φρόνιμος, εὐσεβής.* Atqui, O Malela, tantum abest, ut *sapiens* fuerit iste Glaucus, ut ejus nomen in proverbii consuetudinem venerit, de homine qualis tu es, qui nescit quid sit in rem suam; qui permutat

Χρύσεα χαλκείων, ἑκατόμβοι' ἐννεαβοίων.[b]

Sed est potius ut librarii hoc esse facinus existimem, (præsertim si non idem istud *ἰσχυρὸς* iterasses,) et orationem esse continuandam ad hoc exemplum: (*Αἰνείας*) *εὐπώγων, γλαυκὸς* (*cæsius*), *φρόνιμος, εὐσεβής.*[c] Agnosco *pium* Æneam; et ita plane Isaacius Porphyrogenitus.

Illud p. 329. *Καὶ κατηνέχθη ὁ Σίμων .... ἐπὶ τὴν πλατείαν, καὶ ἐψόφησε,*[d] satis quidem congruenter ad hellenismum vertit interpres,[e] sed non apposite ad sententiam. Quid si interpretemur *τὸ ἐψόφησε*, ut, quod in N. T.[f] de Juda Iscariota dictum est, *ἐλάκησε μέσος, increpuit*[g] *medius?* Hesy-

[[a] *De Comp. Verb.*, *Opp.* t. v. p. 206. ed. Reisk.—De hoc Bacchylidis loco vide Gaisfordium ad *Hephæst.* p. 330., necnon Hermannum in *Elem. Doct. Met.* p. 126. ed. Glas.—D.]

[[b] Hom. *Il.* vi. 236.—D.]

[[c] Malelæ verba sic se habent;

Αἰνείας κονδοειδὴς, παχὺς, εὔστηθος, ἰσχυρὸς, πυῤῥάκης, πλατόψις, εὔρινος, λευκὸς, ἀναφάλας, εὐπώγων.

Γλαῦκος, ἰσχ., φρόν., εὐσ. D.]

[[d] Sic Malelas: *καὶ ηὔξατο ὁ Πέτρος, καὶ κατηνέχθη Σίμων ὁ μάγος ἐκ τοῦ ἀέρος εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐπὶ τὴν πλατ., καὶ ἐψ.*—D.]

[[e] .... "*magno cum sonitu in plateam decidens, interiit.*"—D.]

[[f] *Act. Apost.* i. 18.—D.]

[[g] Legendum videtur "*crepuit.*"—D.]

chius: *Ἔλακεν, ἐψόφησεν* et *Λακεῖν, ψοφῆσαι*. Pagina autem 16 sane dormitavit interpres, ut in opere longo et ingrato facile queat somnus obrepere. *Ἀχαΐα, Πελληνὴ, ἡ καλουμένη Πελοπόννησος· Achæa, Pelena, quæ et Peloponnesus dicta est.* Obsecro, quis istud vel fando audivit? Scribe *Ἀχαΐα, Πελλήνη·* et verte, *Achæa, Pellene, et quæ Peloponnesus vocatur. Πελλήνη* est Achææ urbs. Vide Geographos. Apollonius *Argon.* i.[g]

Ἀστέριος δὲ καὶ Ἀμφίων, Ὑπερασίου υἷες,
Πελλήνης ἀφίκανον Ἀχαιΐδος.

Vereor ne putidum sit adnotare, *Βούττιος, Βόττιος,* et *Βώττιος* vitiose dici apud Malelam pro *Βρούττιος* sive *Βρέττιος*. Hoc quidem exploratum est, cum eandem plane narrationem ex Brutio afferant Georgius et Hieronymus. Ita p. 200 *Θάλης, καὶ Κάστωρ, καὶ Πολύβιος* depravate pro *Θάλλος*. Similiter enim Castorem, Thallum, et Polybium de rebus Assyriacis una citat Syncellus. Et adhuc p. 221 Callimachus *ἐν Ἐτησίοις* pro *Αἰτίοις*. Neque enim *Αἴτιαι* inscribuntur, nequis erret, sed *Αἴτια*, ut in Epigrammate lib. i. *Anthol.* cap. lxvii.[h]

Καλλίμαχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξύλινος νοῦς.
Αἴτιος ὁ γράψας Αἴτια Καλλιμάχου.

Appello ad elegantiorum hominum judicia, annon melior aliquanto sit lectio ex conjectura nostra:

Αἴτιος, ὁ γράψας Αἴτια, Καλλίμαχος.

Cæterum homo Malelæ germanissimus Fulgentius Planciades,[i] *Jentaculum*, inquit, *gustatio dicitur. Callimachus Intesia: Jentaculum proferre Jovi.* Diceres hunc a Joanne *Ἐτήσια* illa mutua petiisse. Illud vero incredibile videatur, Cyrenæum illum Latine loqui et quidem versu: nam sic lego,

[g v. 176.—D.]

[h *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (ed. Jacobs.) t. iii. p. 67.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* t. ii. p. 396.—Hoc distichon Apollonio Rhodio tribuitur: vide Jacobsii *Animadv. in Anth. Gr.* t. ii. p. iii. p. 47.—D.]

[i *Expos. Serm. Antiq.—Auct. Myth. Lat.* p. 779. ed. Van Stav.—D.]

Jentaclum proferre Jovi——Sed minuit admirationem, quod Fulgentius et Mnaseæ *Εὐρωπιακὰ* et Demosthenis *Philippica*[j] viderit Latino sermone conscripta.[k] Sicut Ovidianæ *Ibidis* vetus enarrator putidissimos versus eosque Latinos Eupolidi et (jocularem hominis confidentiam!) Democrito affingit.

Illud præterea pag. 52. *Καθὼς Δήμαρχος ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράψατο περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Διονύσου*, corrupte exhibetur loco *Δείναρχος*. Nam Georgius eandem historiam memorans, *Δείναρχος*, ait, *ὁ ποιητὴς, οὐχ ὁ ῥήτωρ*· et Hieronymus: *Dinarchus poeta, non rhetor.* De quo in diversas sententias ierunt viri docti. Verba Demetrii Magnetis in opere *Περὶ τῶν Ὁμωνύμων*, apud Dionysium Halic.[l] *Δεινάρχοις δὲ ἐνετύχομεν τέτταρσιν, ὧν ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ῥητόρων τῶν Ἀττικῶν· ὁ δὲ τὰς περὶ Κρήτην συναγήοχε μυθολογίας· ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος μὲν ἀμφοῖν τούτοιν, Δήλιος δὲ τὸ γένος, πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος, τοῦτο δὲ πρᾶγμα· τέταρτος δὲ ὁ περὶ Ὁμήρου λόγον συντεθεικώς.* Et Gerardus quidem Vossius in præclaro opere *De Historicis*:[m] *Dinarchus*, ait, *Delius Cretenses fabulas collegit, ut cognoscimus ex Dionysio Hal. . . . Videtur idem signari ab Eusebio, . . . ubi de Bacchi gestis loquens, ait,* Ὡς φησι *Δείναρχος ὁ ποιητὴς, οὐχ ὁ ῥήτωρ.* Condonamus quidem ei *ἁμάρτημα μνημονικόν*· neque enim Delius fuit Cretensium Fabularum collector, sed secundus iste nescio quis; quem vix est ut existimem eas versibus edidisse, saltem hoc non exploratum est. Scaliger in *Græca* Eusebii p. 31.[n] *Viderint*, ait, *eruditi, an tertius Dinarchorum Δήλιος τὸ γένος, πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος,*

[j] Edd. *Epist. ad Mill.*, aut Bentleii aut typothetæ errore, "Philosophica." —D.]

[k] Sed audiamus Fulgentium: "Mnaseas tamen iii. Europæ libro scribsit Apollinem, postquam ab Iove ictus," &c. . . . . "Demosthenes ad Philippum: sed quidem [l. sed ne quid] te Græcum turbet exemplum, ego pro eo Latinum tibi feram," &c. *Expos. Serm. Antiq.—Auct. Myth. Lat.* pp. 768, 774. ed. Van Stav.—D.]

[l] *De Dinarcho Judic., Opp.* t. v. p. 631. ed. Reisk.—D.]

[m] *De Historicis Græcis*, p. 355. ed. 1677.—D.]

[n] p. 254. ed. 1606.—D.]

τοῦτο δὲ πρᾶγμα, sit iste poeta, quem innuit Eusebius. Nam sane mihi ignotus est. Hactenus quidem accedo, ut aut iste sit poeta de quo Eusebius, aut nullus ex quatuor. Sed amabo, quid sibi vult illud *πρᾶγμα*? nam, quantum ego video, nulla ei subest sententia neque scientia. Latine sic vertas: *Dinarchus genere Delius, qui aliquid dixit, et aliquid fecit:* sive, *qui aliquid versu dixit, aliquid re ipsa.* Profecto non multum in Demetrio perdidimus, si omnia sic dixit. Sed opinor neminem inficias iturum, quin mutatione commoda et illi suus honos, et orationi sua sententia restitui possit, si legamus: *πεπραγματευμένος τοῦτο μὲν ἔπος, τοῦτο δὲ γράμμα,* id est, *qui quædam heroico carmine conscripsit, alia oratione prosa:* vel, (quia *τὸ γράμμα* quodvis scripti genus nonnunquam significat,) *τοῦτο δὲ δρᾶμα, qui et poemata heroica et dramata edidit.*

Domninus iste *χρονογράφος* non aliunde quam a Malela cognosci potest a quo sæpissime ad partes vocatur. Antiochensem fuisse certissimis signis deprehendes, ubi per otium licebit locos istos consulere: probabiliter etiam dixeris, deduxisse eum historiam ab exordio mundi usque ad Justiniani tempora. Itaque inclinat animus, ut hunc fuisse Domninum illum existimem, qui ea tempestate fuit ecclesiæ Antiochensis Episcopus. Nam sane sicut hic a Joanne p. 265 Domnus vocatur: ita istum Patriarcham hi Domnum, illi Domninum appellant. Accedit huc, quod plerique omnes, qui aggressi sunt tempora describere, fuerunt Episcopi; Victor, Prosper, Theophilus, Eusebius, et Georgius Episcopus designatus.

Equidem nescio, utra res majorem admirationem attulerit, tot nomina hominum propria a Joanne corrupta esse, an ea menda a doctissimo interprete dissimulata fuisse et silentio prætermissa: verbi gratia; p. 101 et 171 *Τυνδάριος* pro *Τυνδάρεως*. *Ἀνδρόγηος* 107 pro *Ἀνδρόγεως*. *Πλησιώνης* 121 pro *Πληϊόνης*; atque ea quidem non mater erat Atlantis, verum uxor. *Ἰωβάτης* 103 pro *Ἰοβάτης*. *Μηδίαν τὴν τοῦ Ἀέτου* 97 pro *Μηδείαν τὴν τοῦ Αἰήτου*. *Πέλωψ* et *Πέλωπος* 99 et 104 pro *Πέλοψ* et *Πέλοπος*. *Ἀμφίωνα* 55 pro

Ἀμφίονα. Αἰνειάδες pro *Αἰνειάδαι. Ἰωκάστη* 59 pro *Ἰοκάστη. Ἐτεωκλέους* 63 pro *Ἐτεοκλέους. Ἀμφίαρος* 63 pro *Ἀμφιάραος. Δευκαλίων ὁ υἱὸς Ἕλενος τοῦ Πήκου* 84 pro *Ἕλληνος*; nec tamen Deucalionis pater erat Hellen, sed filius. *Ἀντιφάντην* 145 pro *Ἀντιφάτην. Τηλέφου* regis Latinorum 205 pro *Τηλεμάχου*, quorum hic Ulyssis et Penelopes filius, ille Herculis et Auges. Duorum verborum similitudine tota historiæ ratio est perturbata. Sed propemodum omni fide majora sunt errata p. 135, ubi Græcorum duces recenset, qui contra Trojanos arma ceperunt. Nam ut de numero navium, etsi ea ratio longe vitiosissima est, nihil dicam; ecce tibi *Μενέλαος καὶ Λήϊστος* pro *Πηνέλαος καὶ Λήϊτος*. Homerus:

> *Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον,*
> *Ἀρκεσίλαός τε, Προθοήνωρ τε, Κλόνιός τε.*[l]

Μέγης ἐκ Δολίχης τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ex Doliche Helladica, pro *ἐκ Δουλιχίου ἐξεναντίας τῆς Ἤλιδος*·

> *Οἳ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίοιο, Ἐχινάων θ' ἱεράων*
> *Νήσων, αἳ ναίουσι πέρην ἁλὸς, Ἤλιδος ἄντα,*
> *Τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης, ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ.*[m]

Ἀγήνωρ καὶ Τευθίδης. Euge vero, Malela, qui de oppidi nomine heroem confinxisti. Siquidem in Homero legimus *Ἀγαπήνωρ ἐκ Τεγέης*·

> *Οἵ τ' ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην καὶ Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπὺ,*
> . . . . . .
> *Καὶ Τεγέην εἶχον καὶ Μαντινέην ἐρατεινὴν,*
> . . . . . .
> *Τῶν ἦρχ' Ἀγκαίοιο πάϊς, κρείων Ἀγαπήνωρ.*[n]

Ex Tegea eum profectum esse epitaphium[o] satis indicat:

[l *Il.* ii. 494.—D.] [m *Il.* ii. 625.—D.]

[n *Il.* ii. 603 (ubi Οἱ δ' ἔχ. Ἀρκ., ὑπὸ Κυλ. ὄρ. αἰ . .), 607, 609.—D.]

[o Inter *Epitaphia in heroas Homericos*, quæ Aristotelis nomen præferunt: *Anth. Gr. ex rec. Br.* (ed. Jacobs.) t. i. p. 113.—*Anth. Gr. ad fid. Cod. Pal. &c.* t. ii. p. 751.—D.]

Ἀρχὸς ὅδ' ἐκ Τεγέης Ἀγαπήνωρ, Ἀγκαίου υἱὸς,
Κεῖθ' ὑπ' ἐμοῦ, Ταφίων πελτοφόρων βασιλεύς.

Πρόθωος καὶ Μαγνίτωρ. Enimvero apud Malelam facilius heroes nascuntur, quam fungi post pluviam. O fortunatam Antiochiam tanto alumno! Ineptus adeo Homerus, qui pro isto Magnitore gregarios quosdam milites, vilissima capita, e Magnesia duxit:

Μαγνήτων δ' ἦρχε Πρόθοος, Τενθρηδόνος υἱός.[p]

Εὔμενος σὺν νηυσὶν ῑα pro *Εὔμηλος·*

Τῶν ἦρχ' Ἀδμήτοιο φίλος πάϊς ἕνδεκα νηῶν,
Εὔμηλος.[q]

Νηρεὺς ἐκ Μυκήνης pro *Νιρεὺς ἐκ Σύμης·*

Νιρεὺς δ' αὖ Σύμηθεν ἄγε τρεῖς νῆας ἐΐσας.[r]

Χαλίας ἐκ Τρίκκης σὺν νηυσὶν μ̄. Ecce tibi jam tertius heros Chalias, qui a corrupto vocabulo *Οἰχαλίας* prodiit, non aliter ac vermes in putrescenti cadavere nascuntur:

Οἳ δ' εἶχον Τρίκκην, καὶ Ἰθώμην κλωμακόεσσαν,
Οἵ τ' ἔχον Οἰχαλίην, πόλιν Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος,[s]

eos ducebant Podalirius et Machaon. *Λεοντεὺς καὶ Πολυπήτης·* scribe *Πολυποίτης. Ἀμφιγενείας ἐξ Ἰλίου σὺν νηυσὶν μν̄.*[t] Profecto si Troicis temporibus Malelas vixisset, non decem annos totos Græci consumpsissent in unius urbis obsidione: tot iis terræ filios misisset auxilio. *Ἀμφιγενείας* et *Πτελεοῦ* oppidorum meminit Homerus:

Οἵ τε Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο, καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινὴν,
. . . . . .
Καὶ Κυπαρισσήεντα, καὶ Ἀμφιγένειαν ἔναιον,
Καὶ Πτελεὸν, καὶ Ἕλος, καὶ Δώριον.[u]

[p *Il.* ii. 756.—D.]
[q *Il.* ii. 713.—D.]
[r *Il.* ii. 671.—D.]
[s *Il.* ii. 729.—D.]
[t *μγ'.* Mal.—D.]
[u *Il.* ii. 591, 3, 4.—D.]

Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐκ τοῦ Ἄργους τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ex Argis Helladis. Et Argos et Hellas Thessaliæ sunt urbes, ut pueri sciunt: sed hic locus fatalis est ad Malelæ hallucinationes:

Νῦν δ' αὐτοὺς (leg. *αὖ τοὺς*) *ὅσσοι τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἔναιον,*

. . . . . .

Οἵ τ' εἶχον Φθίην, ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,

. . . . . .

Τῶν αὖ πεντήκοντα νεῶν ἦν ἀρχὸς Ἀχιλλεύς.[v]

Φιλοκτήτης ἐκ Μοθόνης vitiose pro *Μηθώνης*· et *Σώρθης, Φίλιππος, Ἄντιφος, σὺν νηυσὶν ὀη.* Quis autem porro mirabitur e cerebello Jovis Minervam esse natam, cum Antiochensis hic ex insulso suo capite progeneret absque ope Vulcani

Ductores Danaûm delectos, prima virorum?[w]

Sorthem heroem nominat pro insula *Carpatho,* ut et Philippum pro Phidippo:

Οἳ δ' ἄρα Νίσυρόν τ' εἶχον, Κράπαθόν τε, Κάσον τε,

. . . . . .

Τῶν δ' αὖ Φείδιππός τε καὶ Ἄντιφος ἡγησάσθην.[x]

Notum est jam a multis sæculis morem invaluisse apud Græcos, ut eodem sono efferrentur *αι* et *ε*, *οι* et *υ*. Tam captiosa pronunciatio mendis infinitis libros opplevit: ut Mal. p. 47 et 49 *τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Αἰχίονος, τῷ Πένθει,* pro *Ἐχίονος*· et e diverso 49 et 55 *ὄρος Κιθερώνιον* pro *Κιθαιρώνειον*· et 106 *Ἀντέωνι* pro *Ἀνταίῳ*· et alia non pauca extant ex eo genere: sic 212 [211] et 171 *Τοῦ Ὕακος, υἱοῦ τοῦ Ναυπλίου,* pro *Οἴακος*· et *Σχυνέως* 169 pro *Σχοινέως*. In codicibus manu notatis promiscuus fere est vocalium horum usus.[y] Hoc diligenter animadverso, deploratissimos locos emen-

[v *Il.* ii. 681, 3, 5.—D.]
[w Lucret. i. 87., ubi . . . . " delecti."—D.]
[x *Il.* ii. 676, 8.—D.]
[y Confer nostrum in Addendis.—D.]

dabit nullo negotio, qui ingenium et judicium in numerato habuerit. Plutarchus *De Iside et Osiride*:[z] *Ἐμπεδοκλῆς δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀγαθουργὸν ἀρχὴν φιλότητα καὶ φιλίαν, πολλάκις δὲ ἁρμονίαν καλεῖσθαι μέροπι· τὴν δὲ χείρονα, νεῖκος οὐλόμενον καὶ δῆριν αἱματόεσσαν.* Frustra hîc Plutarchus per annos ducentos criticorum auxilium imploravit. Tu verte *αι* in *ε*, et lege *Ἁρμονίαν καλεῖ θεμερῶπιν.* Possum excitare ipsum Empedoclem testem hujus correctionis, apud Plutarchum *περὶ Εὐθυμίας*.[a]

Ἔνθ' ἦσαν Χθονίη τε, καὶ Ἡλιόπη ταναῶπις,
Δῆρις θ' αἱματόεσσα, καὶ Ἁρμονίη ἱμερῶπις,
Καλλιστώ τ', Αἰσχρή τε, Θόωσά τε, Δειναιή τε,
Νημερτής τ' ἐρόεσσα, μελάγκαρπός τ' Ἀσάφεια.

Ubi libenter legerim *Δηναιή τε*, ut contraria inter se comparentur. Scio nunc quid in animo tute tecum volutes: sed illud tibi confirmare possum syllabam primam verbi *ἱμερῶπις* esse productam atque longam. Primus id reposuit Henricus Stephanus ex conjectura quantum ego ex re ipsa conjecturam facio. Veteres editiones repræsentant *καὶ ἁρμονίη γε μερῶπις*. Itaque hic quoque legendum est *Ἁρμονίη θεμερῶπις*. Hesych. *Θεμερῶπις*,[b] *ἐρασμία, ἀγχόνη.* Lege *ἐρασμία ἁρμονίη*, auctoritate Empedoclis: nisi si mavis *ἐρασμία αἰσχύνη* ex Æschyli *Prometheo*: *Ἐκ δ' ἔπληξέ μου τὴν θεμερῶπιν αἰδῶ. Αἰδὼς* est *αἰσχύνη.* Perperam huic lectioni Scholiastes et *Etymologici* auctor *θερμερῶπιν* vocem nihili anteponunt, tanquam *θερμαίνουσαν τὴν ὦπα.* Atqui eo pacto *θερμῶπις* esset dicendum: neque enim vel fando auditum est *θέρμερος*. Pollux tamen lib. vi. c. 40.[d] *Τὸ δὲ θερμερύνεσθαι καὶ κιχλιδιᾷν κωμικά.* MS[i] *χλιδιᾷν* vel *κυχλοιδιᾷν*· lege *θεμερύνεσθαι καὶ χλιδᾷν*, vel *χλοιδᾷν*, vel *κυλοιδιᾷν*. Hesychius: *Θέμερον, σεμνὸν, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τὸ σεμνύνεσθαι, θεμερύνεσθαι.*[e] *Θεμέρη, βεβαία, σεμνὴ, εὐσταθής.*

[z *Mor.* t. ii. p. 356. ed. Wyttenb.—D.]
[a *Mor.* t. ii. p. 634. ed. Wyttenb.—D.]
[d p. 670. ed. Hemst.—D.]
[b vulgo *Θεμερόπις*.—D.]
[e vulgo *θεμαρύνεσθαι*.—D.]

Θεμερόφρονας, συνετοὺς, σώφρονας. Sed ut planissime constet, opus est ut strophen et antistrophen inter se conferamus: in quibus hi versus respondent ex adverso:

Ἐκ δ' ἔπληξέ μου τὰν θεμερῶπιν αἰδῶ.
Νεοχμοῖς δὲ νόμοις Ζεὺς ἀθέσμως κρατύνει.[f]

Ubi pro *ἀθέσμως* ex necessitate metri conjeci legendum esse *ἀθετῶς*. Quam conjecturam firmavit Hesychius. *Ἀθετῶς, ἀθέσμως, ἢ συγκατατεθειμένως. Αἰσχύλος Προμηθεῖ δεσμώτῃ*· lege, *οὐ συγκ. sine consensu et approbatione reliquorum deorum.* Respexit ad hunc locum: neque enim alibi in ea fabula occurrit. Plane jam imperitus sit oportet, aut ab invidentia laboret, qui de *θεμερῶπιν* contra veniat. Experiamur, quid in alteram partem possit hæc observatio. Hesychius: *Ἔναστρος, * ὠστεμένας, ἀχαιὸς ἀλφεσίβοιαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑαστὰς γὰρ βάκχας ὑάδας ἔλεγον.* Prodigiosa plane oratio. Nunc vicissim $\bar{\epsilon}$ muta in *αι*, et lege: *Ἔναστρος ὥστε Μαινάς· Ἀχαιὸς Ἀλφεσιβοίᾳ. ἀντὶ τοῦ Ῥάς. τὰς γὰρ Βάκχας Ῥάδας ἔλεγον.* Agnoscis, opinor, principium senarii ex Achæi fabula *Alphesibœa.* Similiter *οι* passim loco $\bar{\upsilon}$ Hesych. *Κοίημα, γέννημα,* pro *Κύημα*· et vice versa *Στυχιοῦσι, διατυποῦσι,* pro *Στοιχειοῦσι.* Idem: *Στοιχείωσις, διατύπωσις, ἡ πρώτη μάθησις.* Itaque Suidas in Lexico diphthongos *αι* et *οι* alieno loco proxime ante $\bar{\epsilon}$ et $\bar{\upsilon}$ collocavit. Extat in Bibliotheca publica Oxonii liber antiqua manu notatus, continens mille regulas de recta scribendi ratione: quarum xl. docent quando *αι* scribere oporteat, et quando $\bar{\upsilon}$: totidemque ubi *οι*, et ubi $\bar{\upsilon}$. Eum codicem, cum ante inter *ἀδεσπότους* ferretur, deprehendi ex procemio versibus senariis scripto literis præ vetustate pene effugientibus obtutum oculorum, Theognoti esse grammatici, quem laudat aliquoties *Etymologici* scriptor. Et quidem omnia ibi reperi, quæ iste Theognoto accepta retulit. De ætate hominis rescisces ex præfatione, cujus initium est,

Τῷ δεσπότῃ μου, καὶ σοφῷ στεφηφόρῳ

[f vv. 135, 154. ed. Blomf.—D.]

Λέοντι, τῷ κρατοῦντι πάντων ἐν λόγοις,
Θεύγνωτος εὔγνωτός τις ὡς ὢν οἰκέτης.

Constitueram hic Epistolæ finem imponere: sed intervenit amicus meus,[e] aurium convitio rationem efflagitans, cur Joannes *Malelas* mihi dicatur, qui a Vossiorum utroque, Usserio, aliisque omnibus qui in hunc usque diem ejus mentionem fecerunt, *Malela* nominatur. Ego vero, inquam, ne in virorum quidem maximorum verba juraverim: sed in aliam sententiam, ubi commodum est, quanquam invitus, meo jure discedo. Roget igitur quispiam, cur *Malela* potius sit vocitandus? hoc scilicet ab iis responsum feret: Apud Constantinum sic appellari, *Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπίκλην Μαλέλα*, et apud Damascenum, *Ἰωάννου τοῦ καὶ Μαλάλα·* nusquam alibi commemorari, præterquam apud Tzetzem *Ἰωάννης τις Μελέλης*. Atqui, si ita res se habet, vulgo et passim reperias *τοῦ Σουίδα, τοῦ Θωμᾶ, τοῦ Ἀριστέα, τοῦ Φιλητᾶ, τοῦ Τριόπα, τοῦ Σκόπα, τοῦ Κρατεύα·* nec tamen propterea vel *Suida* Grammaticus dicitur, vel *Thoma* Apostolus, vel *Aristea de* LXXII. *interpretibus*. Ratio videlicet linguæ Græcæ vix aut nullo modo patiatur, ut in A literam virilia nomina casu recto terminentur. Atque ea causa est, cur peregrina virorum nomina, quæ in A exeunt, a Græcis inflectantur in *Ας·* *Γάλβας, Σύλλας, Νουμᾶς, Σενέκας, Ἀγρίππας*. Quod si adeo jam exploratum est, nominativum Græcum esse *Μαλέλας·* nolim ego Latine vertens postremam literam abjicere præter morem et consuetudinem eorum temporum, quibus maxime viguit honos et gratia Latini sermonis. Vetustiores quidem, ut auctor est Quintilianus l. i. c. 5.[f] *Non in A et S literas exire temere masculina Græca nomina recto casu patiebantur. Ideoque et apud Cælium legimus,* Pelia Cincinnatus; *et apud Messalam,* Benefecit Euthia; *et apud Ciceronem,* Hermagora: *ne miremur, quod ab antiquorum plerisque* Ænea *et* Anchisa *sit dictus.* Priscianus lib. v.[g] *Apud Græcos in Ας desinentia, . . . apud nos in A terminantur: ut Μαρσύας,*

[e scil. Hodius,—quem *De autoris cognomine* disputantem videas.—D.]
[f t. i. p. 129. ed. Spald., ubi "Ne in A quidem atque S," &c.—D.]
[g p. 641. ed. Putsch.—D.]

Σωσίας, Βυῤῥίας, Χαιρέας, Τουρίας, Βαγράδας· Marsya, Sosia, Byrrhia, Chærea, Turia, Bagrada. Libro autem vi. pag. 681 et 701.[h] *plerumque* ait et *frequenter* hoc fieri solere.[i] Et his fortassis auctoribus tueri se posse arbitrentur, qui e contraria parte dicunt. Mihi vero longe videtur secus: sed oportet haud jejune de hac causa, et tanquam in transitu, sed plene copioseque disputare. Principio, nulla controversia est, quin indigena Latinorum sermo nullum habuerit nominativum in *As* cum genitivo *ἰσοσυλλάβῳ*. Quapropter antiquitus, sive Græcus quispiam in Latina civitate viveret, sive Græca scripta in Latinum converterentur, ejuscemodi nomina per A plerumque scribere et pronunciare placuit. Atque hoc quidem ex ingenio et consuetudine linguæ vernaculæ ab iis est factitatum. Comici igitur in Græcis interpretandis eam rationem tenuerunt; *Chærea, Sosia, Byrrhia, Phania, Clinia, Demea, Phædria,* proferentes. Nimirum auribus vulgi ista dabantur. Nec tamen deerant etiam antiqua illa memoria (pace Quintiliani dixerim), qui ad Græcorum exemplum instituerent loqui: quantum ex eorum reliquiis conjectura consequi possum. Apud Gellium lib. iii. c. 7. verba sunt Catonis Censoris, qui ea tempestate in rep. floruit, qua Plautus in scena: *Leonidas Lacedæmonius laudatur:* Plauto tamen in *Asinaria* servus dicitur *Leonida.* Claudius Quadrigarius apud Gellium l. iii. c. 8. *Ad nos venit Nicias familiaris tuus.* Lucilius apud Donatum:[j]

Ante fores autem et triclini limina quidam
Perditu' Tiresia tussi grandævu' gemebat.

Ubi legendum est *Tiresias:* nisi si syllabam natura brevem propter cæsuram produci existimas. Priscianus lib. vi.[k] *Hic Calchas Calchantis, quamvis hic Calchas hujus Calchæ, antiquissimi declinabant.* Sed in his locis fortasse fides exemplarium suspecta esse possit: in illo Plinii lib. xxxv. cap. 10.[l] nullus datur suspicioni locus. *Decet non sileri et*

[h ed. Putsch.—D.]
[i Confer nostrum in Addendis.—D.]
[j Ad Ter. *Eun.* ii. 3, 44.—D.]
[k p. 702. ed. Putsch.—D.]
[l t. ii. p. 702. ed. Hard. 1723.—D.]

Ardeatis templi pictorem, præsertim civitate donatum ibi, et carmine, quod est in ipsa pictura his versibus:

Dignis digna loca picturis condecoravit
Reginæ Junoni' Supremi conjugi' templum
Marcus Ludius Elotas Ætolia oriundus,
Quem nunc et post semper ob artem hanc Ardea laudat.

Ea[l] *sunt scripta antiquis literis Latinis.* Elotas est *Εἰλώτας, εἰλώτης*. Gruterus[m] epigramma hoc profert, tanquam a Boissardo visum in hortis Julii III. Pontif. Romani;

DIGNE DOCTILOQVEIS PICTVREIS,

et quæ sequuntur. Sine dubio falsarius aliquis in lapide inscribendum curaverat, a Plinio id mutuatus. Profecto male operam lusit in versu primo corrigendo. Editio Veneta anni MCCCCLXXXIII. habet *Dignis digna loco.* Lego igitur:

Dignis dignu' loco picturis condecoravit.

Lucilius:[n]

Samnis, spurcus homo, vita illa dignu' locoque.

Dignus loco est *τῶν μέσων*· et in bonam vel malam partem capi potest. Nihil verius hac emendatione. In eadem est editione *Ætolia orundus,* longe quidem melius, quam quod in indice Scaligeri est, *Ætola oriundus.* Lucretius lib. ii.[o]

Denique cœlesti sumus omnes semine orundi.

Sive mavis cum vulgatis libris, *oriundi;* certe trisyllabon sit necesse est. Sic igitur vetustis illis mos erat, ut interdum quidem in AS, frequentius in A Græca nomina vellent exire. Postea vero, ut ait Quintilianus,[p] *recentiores instituerunt Græcis nominibus Græcas declinationes potius dare.* Proinde hoc institutum tenuerunt Lucretius,[q]

Id quod Anaxagoras sibi sumit:

[l vulgo "Eaque."—D.] [m t. ii. p. 1065. ed. 1707.—D.]
[n Apud Non. Mar. (cap. iv.) in v. *spurcum.*—D.]
[o v. 990.—D.] [p t. i. p. 130. ed. Spald.—D.] [q i. 876.—D.]

Varro *De R. R.*, antiqui tamen ut qui maxime amator sermonis, *Archytas, Hegesias, Athenagoras, Mnaseas:* et apud Nonium[p] in Scaturex, *Ismenias Thebogenes fluit scaturex;* lege *Thebagenes,* Θηβαγενής. Et similiter Cicero, apud quem vulgo occurrunt *Archias, Gorgias, Phidias, Cineas, Prusias, Arcesilas, Charmadas, Critias, Diagoras, Hippias, Lysias,* et siqua similia. Nam de *Hermagora* Ciceronis, vereor ne vitioso codice usus sit Quintilianus. Profecto enim omnes omnino, qui nunc supersunt MSS. constanter habent *Hermagoras.* Sed melius est ex ipsis locis experimentum judicii capere, libro primo *De Inventione; Hujus constitutionis Hermagoras inventor esse existimatur:*[q] et ibidem; *Quod si magnam in his Hermagoras habuisset facultatem.*[r] Repone hic paulisper *Hermagora inventor,* et *Hermagora habuisset;* non sentis vocalium concursum vaste hiantem? Ego vero Ciceronem ita scripsisse ne ipsi quidem Ciceroni affirmanti crediderim. Quid dicam de scriptoribus ævi Augustæi? quid de insequentium ætatum? nempe eadem tum consuetudo invaluit, ut in *As* caderent Græca nomina. Spero mihi fidem apud te esse; ne necesse habeam infinita hic exempla enumerare. Quod tamen cum exceptione dictum velim; ut, quanquam eruditi homines eum, quem dixi, morem servaverunt, nomina tamen servorum, aut quicunque, ut principio dixi, in Latina civitate vixere, vulgaris usus, penes quem jus est loquendi, plerumque immutaverit ad Latinam consuetudinem. Inde est apud Ciceronem, *Phania* Appii libertus. Frustra enim græcissaret dominus; cum ab omnibus conservis et notis sine *s* litera *Phania* is vocabatur. Sed a Plinio memoratur *Phanias physicus:* nempe is in Græcia vitam egerat, nullum habuerat Romæ dominum aut patronum. Inde illud Horatii, *Credat Judæus Apella,*[s] id est, quivis Judæus; ut locum explanem parum hac memoria intellectum. Judæi habitabant trans Tiberim, et multo maximam partem erant libertini, ut fatetur Philo in *Legatione ad Caium.* Apella autem libertinorum est nomen, satis

[p cap. ii., ubi "Is. *hic* Th." &c.—D.]
[q cap. xi.—D.]
[r cap. vi.—D.]
[s *Serm.* i. 5. 100.—D.]

frequens in inscriptionibus vetustis. Cic. *Ep.* 25. lib. vii. *Ne Apellæ quidem liberto tuo dixeris.* Itaque *Credat Judæus Apella,* quasi tu dicas, Credat superstitiosus aliquis Judæus Transtiberinus. Inde illud alterum, *Obeundus Marsya*:[t] quo modo etiam loquuntur Ovidius, Silius, Lucanus. Marsya scilicet in Foro collocatus et donatus quasi civitate Romana non potuit non in ore vulgi quotidie versari; et præterea eo nomine fuerunt servi Phryges. In veteri marmore, M. HELVIVS M. L. MARSYA. Vulgi autem auctoritatem libenter hic secuti sunt poetæ; cum secundum Græcam pronunciationem *Marsyas* in hexametro non staret. Sic *Cassius Chærea* tribunus plebis, notissimus ob Caii Cæsaris cædem: alter apud Plinium statuarius, qui nunquam credo Italiam viderat; et apud Varronem tertius Atheniensis, qui de Re Rustica scripsit, *Chæreas.* Ita Persius (priusquam Cornutus stoicus versum immutaverat metu Neronis), *Auriculas asini Mida rex habet*;[u] et ad id exemplum Justinus: nullam aliam ob causam, præterquam quod id nomen frequenter mancipiis est inditum, præsertim ex Phrygia emptis. Terentius *Phormione*:[v] *Puer ad me occurrit Mida.* Vetus lapis apud Sponium p. 289. MIDA CVBICVLARIVS. Nequeo tamen conjectura augurari, cur qui Nepoti *Perdiccas,* Curtio et Justino et quibusdam aliis *Perdicca* nominetur. Siquidem apud utrumque cætera omnia Græco more proferuntur, *Amyntas, Bagoas, Philotas, Ophellas, Iollas, Gobryas, Alcetas* frater Perdiccæ. Nullos memini Perdiccas inter Italorum servos aut libertos: neque quicquam aliud causæ invenire possum. Nam cognomenta libertinorum (ea ipsis nomina fuerunt, priusquam manu mitterentur), si Græce in *As* caderent, Latinam terminationem plerumque ceperunt. Non tamen usquequaque increbuisse eam consuetudinem ex antiquis inscriptionibus animadverti. Nam ecce tibi hæc nomina ex Grutero, Reinesio, Sponio. *Ἀχιλλας. M. Cornelius Achillas. L. Pontius Achilas.*[w] ¶ *Ἀ-*

[t *Serm.* i. 6. 120.—D.]

[u *Sat.* i. 121.—D.]

[v V. 6. 22., ubi "*accurrit.*"—D.]

[w Ed. Cant. *Epist. ad Mill.* "Achillas:" sed vide Grut. *Inscr.* p. 851. ed. 1707.—D.]

λεξᾶς, ὑποκοριστικὸν ab Ἀλέξανδρος. *Q. Hortensius Q. L. Alexa. Suavettius Alexa.* ¶ Ἀνδρέας. *C. Quinctius Andrea.* ¶ Ἀπελλᾶς (Ἀπολλᾶς apud Athenæum) ab Ἀπολλόδωρος. *T. Claudius Apella.* ¶ Ἁρποκρᾶς ab Ἁρποκράτης vel Ἁρποκρατίων. *M. Lollius Arphocras.*[x] *C. Herennius Harpocra.* ¶ Ἀρτεμᾶς ab Ἀρτεμίδωρος. *C. Cæcilius Artemas. Cecilius Dexter et Artimas fratres. Æ. Fl. Artema. L. Laberius Artemas.* ¶ Ἀθηναγόρας. *Vireius Athenagoras.* ¶ Κλεόπας in *N. Test.*, vel fortasse Κλεοπᾶς, a Κλεόπατρος vel Κλεόφιλος. *Ti. Cleuphas.* ¶ Κλεινίας vel Κλινίας. *Juli. Clinias. Q. Pomp. Clinias.* ¶ Κτησίας. *M. Aur. Ctesias.* ¶ Sic *Dama* apud Persium, si Græcum est, a Δαμᾶς vel Δημᾶς, quod est diminutivum a Δημήτριος. *Mettius Damas.* ¶ Ἐπαφρᾶς ab Ἐπαφρόδιτος. *G. Avillius Epaphra. M. Cornelius Epaphra. C. Curtius Epaphra. C. Julius Epaphra. P. Nonius Epaphra. C. Pricilius Epaphra. S. Propertius Epaphra. C. Veiacus C. L. Epaphra.* Et e diverso, *Epaphras postremum præstitit officium.* ¶ Γλαυκίας. *Glaucias Lib.* ¶ Γοργίας. *Gorgias Lib. L. Abuccius Gorgia.* Spon. 288. ¶ Ἡρᾶς ab Ἡρόδωρος. *L. Abuccius Hera. M. Petronius Heras. P. Sulpicius Hera. P. Valerius Hera.* ¶ Ἡρακλᾶς ab Ἡρακλεόδωρος Clem. *Stromat.* v. *L. Æmilius Heracla. C. Annius Heracla. C. Camelius Heracla. L. Clodius Heracla. L. Cornificius Heracla. Q. Cornelius Heracla. L. Creperius Heracla. L. Licinius Heracla. F. Longinus Heracla. C. Stiminius Heracla. Q. Petinius Q. L. Heraclas.* ¶ Ἑρμᾶς ab Ἑρμόδωρος. *Herma accommodator. L. Æmilius Hermas. P. Annius Herma. C. Cassius Herma. Cornelius Hernia* (vitiose pro *Herma*). *M. Junius Hernia* (lege *Herma*). *Q. Lollius Herma. M. Mag. Herma. Octavius Herma. C. Quinctius Herma. P. Statius Herma. P. Turannius Herma. Q. Vibius Herma. M. Ulpius Aug. Lib. Herma.* ¶ Ἑρμαγόρας. *L. Mæcius L. F. Hermagoras.* ¶ Ἑρμείας. *Aurelius Hermias Aug. Lib. T. Didius Hermias. M. Helvius Hermias. C. Julius Hermia. Sex. Pompeius Sex. Hermia.* Spon. 221. lege *Sex. L. Her.* ¶ Λεοντᾶς

[x Ed. Cant. *Epist. ad Mill.* "Arpocras," et mox "Cleophas:" sed vide Grut. *Inscr.* p. 801. et p. 649. ed. 1707.—D.]

fortasse ὑποκοριστικὸν a Λεόντιος. *L. Arcius Leontas. C. Julius Leontas. M. Herennius M. L. Leonta.* ¶ Λεωνᾶς. Artemidorus, p. 249. Λεωνᾶς ὁ Σύρος ὁ παλαιστής. *Fabius Leonas. C. Oppius C. L. Leonas.* ¶ Μηνᾶς a Μηνόδωρος. *D. Lallius Mena.* ¶ Μητρᾶς a Μητρόδωρος. *C. Fyrmius Metras.* ¶ Νικίας. *M. Annius Nicia. Cluvius A. L. Nicia. A. Plautius Nicia.* ¶ Νικήτας. *Aur. Niceta.* ¶ Ὀνησᾶς ab Ὀνησίφορος. *Q. Virius Onesas.* ¶ Παπίας. *C. Marcius C. F. Papia. Munatius Papa* (an depravatum loco *Papia*, an a Πάπας). *M. Plutius M. L. Papia. C. Purellius Papia. L. Valerius Papia.* ¶ Φιλώτας. *A. Annius Philotas.* ¶ Φιλᾶς a Φιλόδημος. *M. Hirrius Phila.* ¶ Φιλέας. *L. Magius Phileas.* ¶ Φανίας. *Phania* apud Terentium et Ciceronem. *Fl. Phaneas. M. Tillius M. L. Phanias.* ¶ Θευδᾶς vel Θεοδᾶς a Θεόδωρος. *A. Fæsonius Thuda. Q. Veionius Teuda.* ¶ Θεωνᾶς Alexandriæ Episcopus, *Theonas* apud S. Hieron. *Livius Theona Aug. L.*, et *Livius Theona ab Epistulis Græc.* ¶ Ζάβδας Hierosol. Episcopus, *Zabdas* S. Hieron. et *Zabdæ*, in monumento L. Valerii *Saufeius Sabda.* ¶ Ζηνᾶς a Ζηνόδωρος. *L. Calpurnius Zena.* Enimvero jam percontari eos velim, qui sine S litera *Malela* pronunciant, quo auctore didicerint Joannem hunc Antiochensem captivum in Italiam abductum servitutem ibi serviisse; tandem autem, postea quam libertatem receperat, ad historiam scribendam se contulisse? Sin autem; cur obsecro, cum Evandri matre et cascis illis allium obolentibus, aut cum fæce Romuli loqui malunt; quam cum Cicerone, et bonis auctoribus Latinitatis? Mihi quidem non longa deliberatio est, utros imitari velim. Sed hæc nimium fortasse studiose atque anxie: nisi quod omnino respondendum fuit iis, a quibus sum provocatus. Siquidem Gerardus Vossius, qui nescio an ab interprete Damasceni in errorem ipse inductus sit, certe aliis exemplo suo et auctoritate viam ad errationem munivit, non certo judicio, sed inconsiderate præterque morem videtur egisse. Quippe qui nunquam alias abjecerit S: ne tum quidem cum auctores haberet, quos etsi perverse, saltem aliquatenus imitaretur. Apud quem *Chæreas* vocatur histo-

ricus et *Clinias*, *Marsyas* Macedonicarum rerum scriptor et Delphicarum *Apellas*: nec tamen *Chærea* et *Clinia* in comœdia, neque Horatii *Marsya* et *Apella* tenacissimam ejus memoriam fugere potuerunt.

Tantum quod hæc scripseram, Milli jucundissime, cum ecce mihi nova res atque improvisa nunciatur, quæ de sententiæ me meæ statu propemodum dejecit. *Enimvero, quod in superiore causa probanda tantopere desudarem, nihil fuisse; meque in ea disceptatione prorsus ἄσκοπα τετοξευκέναι.*[y] *Nam apud Constantinum et Damascenum τοῦ Μαλέλα posse nomen indeclinabile esse: neque abhorrere ab usu Græcorum, ut nomina barbara sine variatione casuum proferantur, τοῦ Ἀμμοῦν, τὸν Ἀνοὺβ, τῷ Ἀσκοὺμ, τοῦ Βλὰχ, τοῦ Ἄψκαλ, &c. sexcenta dari masculina in* A, *ut ὁ Σισάρα, ὁ Σάλα, ὁ Φουὰ, ὁ Σιβὰ in Vet. Test., ὁ Ζαρὰ, ὁ Ἀβία in Novo: Syrorum nationem* (*Syrum autem esse hunc Malelam*) *amare nomina in* A *literam exeuntia, Maruta, Barsoma, et pleraque omnia; sic et Arabas quoque Abdalla, Mashalla, Taphala, et siqua sunt alia: occurrere denique apud Cantacuzenum Ἰωάννης Περάλτα, et apud Theophanem Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπίκλην Ἡμοῦλα; Joannes cognomento Hemula, secundum Victorem Tununensem.* Ego vero, quanquam fortasse præstabilius esset, ut ex amicorum consilio supersederem labore respondendi, libera esse judicia sinerem: constitui tamen devorare eam molestiam; et eo quidem animo, nullum ut certamen instituam, neque enim temperato calamo res agetur; sed ut semel defungar, nec tacendo committam, ut odiosæ mihi de lana caprina lites succrescant in posterum. Dico itaque neque esse illud, de quo viri docti asseverant, neque posse. Nam ecce tibi Joannes Tzetzes, qui cum *ἰωνικωτέρως πως* protulerit *Μελέλης*, certe secundum me judicasse videatur. Crebro enim eæ syllabæ permutantur inter se, *Λεωνίδας Λεωνίδης, Ἑρμᾶς Ἑρμῆς, Ἀπελλᾶς Ἀπελλῆς, Μαλέλας Μαλέλης*. Eodem accedit, quod in syllaba secunda statuitur accentus, *τοῦ Μαλέλα* tanquam ab *ὁ Μαλέλας*, non *Μάλελα* neque *Μαλελὰ*, ut plerumque assolet in vocabulis peregrinis.

[y Lucian. *Toxar.*—*Opp.* t. ii. p. 566. ed. Hemst.—D.]

Verum illud in primis est admiratione dignum, quod ut de Græco nomine cognitio habeatur, ἐπ' ἀλλοθρόους ἀνθρώπους et ad barbaras nationes provocant. Siquidem ex Hunnorum gente sunt Ἀσκοὺμ et Βλὰχ, de quibus vide ipsum Malelam p. 159 et 170. Verum age, quandoquidem sic agi placet, cedo quos volent arbitros. Stabimus etiam Hunnorum judicio: neque homines plebeii, sed reges et regibus proximi pronunciabunt. Verba sunt Malelæ p. 59. Καὶ ἤνεγκεν [αὐτὸν] ἅμα αὐτῷ κατὰ Ἀττιλᾶ. Maxime regum, bona tua venia libenter rogaverim, qui Græce vocaris casu recto. Cur autem occupato molesti sumus? Respondebit pro eo Malelas ibidem: Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Ἀττιλᾶς ἐτελεύτησε. Sic omnes uno ore. Apud Priscum Thracem in Collectaneis Constantini Porphyrogeniti: corrigendus obiter Suidas, qui Πρίσκος ait Πανίτης . . . ἔγραψεν ἱστορίαν Βυζαντικὴν καὶ κατὰ Ἄτταλον· lege haud cunctanter, Βυζαντιακὴν καὶ κατὰ Ἀττήλαν vel Ἀττήλα· apud Priscum, inquam, aliquoties legas Ἀττήλας καὶ Βλήδας. Is Attilæ frater erat, a Jornande Bleta dictus, a Prospero depravate Bleba, a Theophane Βδέλας· Ἀττιλᾶς, inquit,[z] Ὀμνουδίου παῖς . . . ἀποβαλὼν Βδέλαν τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἀδελφόν. Verbum illud dividuum facito, et scribe ὁ Μνουδίου παῖς, vel fortasse Μουνδζίου. Jornandes enim Mundzuccum nominat, et Sigebertus Mundzuch, perperam vero Nicephorus Callistus Νουμίδιον. Quid Attilæ patruus, Ῥούα ne declinabile an Ῥούας? De hoc statuet idem ille Priscus, cujus verba sunt,[a] Ῥούα βασιλεύοντος τῶν Οὔννων et παρὰ τὸν Ῥούαν ἀφικνεῖσθαι. Ita Βάλας dux Hunnorum apud Procopium, Vandalorum Ἀμμάτας, Gotthorum Γρίππας et Βέσσας, et Μόῤῥας et Μαρκίας, et Ἀλβίλας et Οὐσδρίλας. Eant nunc et ab Hunnis malum sibi mendicent. Apud Malelam reperio p. 210. Τζίττα στρατηλάτου Ῥωμαίων· et 202. κατὰ Σουνίκα καὶ Σίμμα· et 111. μετὰ τοῦ ἡνιόχου Καλλιόπα· et 165. μετὰ τοῦ φυλάρχου Ἀρέθα· plane ut apud Constantinum est τοῦ ἐπίκλην Μαλέλα. Placetne jam, ut Joannem ipsum nobis arbitrum capiamus? æqua, opinor, et honesta postulatio est. Sententiam vero is suam

[z p. 88. ed. 1655.—D.] [a *Excerp. De Legat.* p. 47. ed. 1648.—D.]

ostendit p. 204. *ὅστις Τζίττας*· 203. *Ζουνίκας δὲ καὶ Σίμμας*· 110. *Καλλιόπας τις ἡνίοχος*· 166. *Ἀρέθας τις ὁ φύλαρχος καὶ Γνούφας*. Et adhuc dubitent, si possunt, utrumne qui hæc scripserit, ullo modo est ut *ὁ Μαλέλα* vocatus fuerit. Jam *Σισάρα* et *Φουὰ* quam inviti et recusantes in argumentum ducuntur! Recte quidem factum a LXXII. viris, quod cum vetusta illa et Ogygia nomina literis Græcis mandarent, ad syllabam de sermone barbaro expresserunt. Nam qui annis ante permultis excesserant e vita, nulla, credo, iis futura erat consuetudo cum Græcis. Quod si alii juniores, quibus eadem quæ veteribus illis nomina, usum et commercium cum Græcis habuerunt, sine dubio eorum nomina declinata sunt ad normam Græci sermonis. Sic *Paralip.* I. cap. 8. est quidam *Ἀνανία*, et cap. 12. *Βερχία*, vel, ut in MS° Regio est, *Βαραχία*. Eadem occurrunt nomina in *Test. Novo;* (Syrus enim interpres et hic et illic ܚܢܢܝܐ, ܒܪܟܝܐ, *Hhananio, Brachio;*) cum Græca tamen terminatione, *Ἀνανίας, Βαραχίας*. Similiter antiqui illi *Ἰακὼβ, Ἰωσὴφ, Σαοὺλ* perpetuo nominantur: juniores vero, qui cum Græcis rem habuerunt, *Ἰάκωβος, Ἰώσηπος, Σαῦλος*. Quo exemplo etiam *Σισάρας* et *Σάλας* et *Φούας* essent dicti; si Antiochiæ vixissent vel in alia quavis civitate Græca, et memoriam rerum gestarum literis consignassent. Neque vero inficior Syrorum atque Arabum nomina frequenter in A litera terminari: servatam esse a Græcis eam terminationem pernego. *Abdalla, Masalla, Taphala.* Ita quidem Arabes. Quomodo autem Græci? Theophanes p. 294. *Μουαμὲδ ὁ τοῦ Ἀβδελᾶ*. Perii equidem, in A hoc exit, et contra me facit. Sed nolo eos in lætitiam frustra conjicere. Illud enim perincommode intervenit ibidem *ὁ Ἀβδελᾶς υἱὸς*, et apud Zonaram *Μασάλμας ὁ τῶν Ἀράβων ἀρχηγὸς*, apud Malelam *Ταφαρᾶς ὁ φύλαρχος*. Eadem mihi de Syriacis nominibus sententia est. Porphyrius apud Eusebium Scaligeri:[b] *Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ἀγανακτήσας, ὅτι τῷ Πηλουσίῳ προσέβαλεν ὁ Δημήτριος, ἅτε τῶν κατ' Αἴγυπτον πραγμάτων ἐχόμενος, πέμπει βασιλέα τῆς Ἀσίας Ἀλέξανδρον, ὡς υἱὸν*

[[b] p. 227. ed. 1606., ubi . . . . *ἀγοραστὸς εἶναι νενομίσθαι τοῦ* Πτολ.—D.]

Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὃς διὰ τὸ ὡς ἀγοραστὸς εἶναι τοῦ Πτολεμαίου Ζαβινᾶς ἐπεκλήθη πρὸς τῶν Σύρων et Josephus: *Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Ζεβινᾶν ἐπιλεγόμενον.* Et eodem nomine Antiochensis Episcopus *Ζεβῖνος* Nicephoro, *Ζέβεννος Zebennus* Eusebio et Hieronymo vocatur. Atqui *ἀγοραστὸς emptus* Syriace est ܙܒܝܢܐ *Zbino* vel *Zbina.* Ita Græce dixeris, *Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἀντιοχεὺς, ὃς διὰ τὸ φιλολόγος εἶναι Μαλέλας ἐπεκλήθη πρὸς τῶν Σύρων,* vel, ut propius Syrorum pronunciationem subsequitur Damascenus ipse Syrus, *Μαλάλας.* Nam ܡܠܠܐ *Malolo* vel *Malala* est *orator, eloquens, loquax.* Non difficile est conjectura assequi, utram ob causam cognomento illo auctus fuerit Joannes, *Λαλεῖν ἄριστος, ἀδυνατώτατος λέγειν.*[c] Ipse Porphyrius a popularibus suis Syris ܡܠܟܐ *Malcho* sive *Malcha* vocabatur: Græce vero non *Μάλχα,* sed *Μάλχος.* Ita ܟܐܦܐ *Cipha* saxum *Κηφᾶς,* ܬܐܘܡܐ *Thoma* gemellus *Θωμᾶς,* et siqua sunt alia. Mal. p. 41. *Ἀντίοχον τὸν ἐπίκλην Χούζωνα.* Mirum ni ex illorum sententia cognomentum Antiochi fuit *Chuzona* casu recto, ut *Malela:* cum ambo sint Antiochenses. Quid ergo sibi volunt ista p. 65. *Ἀντίοχον τὸν Χούζωνα, τὸν ἔγγονον Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Χούζωνος?* Quod si usquequaque Syriaca nomina imitari et exprimere debemus, cur, obsecro, *Ἰωάννης* dicitur, non *Ἰωανὰν Μαλάλα?* nam Syris est ܝܘܚܢܢ *Juhhanon,* ut LXXII. viris *Ἰωανάν.* Sed ecce tibi Cantacuzenus, qui p. 874 [718]. *Λατίνων τις,* ait, *Ἰωάννης Περάλτα προσαγορευόμενος.* Scias autem in quantas angustias adducti sunt, cum homines *χθὲς καὶ πρώην γεγονότας* sæculo demum XIV. post Christum natum inveterata jam barbaria, causæ suæ patronos adoptant. Rem sane lepidam et jocosam. Joannes hic Antiochensis bene Græce *Μαλέλα* dici potest, quia Italo cuidam nomen erat *Giovanni Peralta.* Sic enim Cantacuzenus p. 174 [874]. *Μάλιστα δὲ Ντζιουὰν Περάλτα ὁ τούτων ἡγεμών.* Græcus iste est sermo hodiernus: ita giostra *τζοῦστρα,* gingiva *τζιντζίβα,* jecur *ντζηγάριον.* Vah! quam velim progrediantur longius, atque una opera probent *Ντζιουὰν Μαλέλα* dicendum esse: facinus pol magnum et memorabile fecerint.

[c Eupolis apud Plutarch. in *Alcib.*—*Opp.* t. ii. p. 21. ed. Reisk.—D.]

Illud vero durum, quod apud Theophanem est *Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπίκλην Ἡμοῦλα*. Nec a Victore solum vocatur *Hemula*, sed Anastasio etiam, qui Theophanem in Latinum convertit: a Liberato Diacono Joannes Mela; nisi fortasse depravati sunt codices. Ex Græcis vero scriptoribus solus Theophanes et semel duntaxat cognominis ejus mentionem facit: cæteris simpliciter Joannes vocatur, Nicephoro Patriarcha, Nicephoro Callisto; sicut et Leontio Byzantio, *Chronicoque Orientali*. Quo magis adducor, ut vitiosum esse illud verbum existimem; et istum apicem, qui in libris MSS. terminationem *ας* signare solet, ab indiligenti librario mutatum esse vel prætermissum. Præsertim cum cuncta id genus nomina præter hoc unum ab ipso Theophane per *ας* scribi videam; *Ἀρέθας*, *Ἀττίλας*, *Μασάλμας*, *Ἀβουλάβας*, *Κουτζίνας*, aliaque quamplurima. Itaque hoc in loco, ut mea fert opinio, facta est Theophani injuria. Nec, quod Anastasius et Victor *Hemula* Latine nuncupant, non *Hemulas;* magis id quenquam movere debet, quam quod Attila a Latinis dicitur, qui Græcis est *Ἀττίλας*. Nam peregrina ejuscemodi nomina Græci Latinique neutri ab alteris, sed ab ipsis barbaris utrique acceperunt. Toto igitur cœlo erravit Priscianus, cum *Turia* et *Bagrada* (Africæ sunt ista flumina) declinari putat a *Τουρίας* et *Βαγράδας*. A Græcis quidem *Ἰόβας*, *Μικίψας*, et *Βάρκας* sunt dicti, qui a Latinis Juba, Micipsa, Barca. Nec tamen hæc quæ proxime nominavi, de Græcia petita sunt; sed ex Africa recto itinere deportata sunt in Italiam. Quid enim, cum illi *Ἀμίλκας*, *Ἀννίβας* proferunt, hi Hamilcar et Hannibal; non signi hoc satis est, unde utraque sunt accersita? Nempe hi masculina nomina Africana in A libenter retinebant; Græcorum aures tanquam absona et inconcinna repudiabant. Sed ut concedam illud *Ἡμοῦλα* a Theophane profectum esse: non ego monachum aliquem adversus omnium auctoritatem magistrum dicendi capere velim; sed illum ipsum ad nationis suæ exemplum, addo etiam suum, componere. Vir multiplici doctrinæ copia præditus Eustathius Thessalonicensis Episc. accurate disputans de Homericis illis *ἱππήλατα Πηλεὺς* et *Ἑρμείας*

ἀκάκητα, &c., non *Σισάρα* et *Σάλα*, non *Ἡμοῦλα* ad partes vocat; nam *Giovanni Peralta* qui potuit, priusquam is nasceretur? quod contra ex omni memoria duo duntaxat memorat masculina Græca in A, eaque minime a se lecta, sed Eudæmonis fide Pelusiotæ; ejus, opinor, cujus librum *De Orthographia* Stephanus Byzantius et Suidas et *Etymologici* scriptor citant: horum unum Illyricum esse nomen, ex epigrammate quodam,[d] *Πατὴρ δ' ἔμ' ἔφυσε Κόπαινα, ἤτοι Κοπαίνης·* Syracusanum alterum ex Sophrone, *ὁ Μύριλλα·* Democopum videlicet architectum, cum theatrum exædificasset Syracusis, populo viritim unguentum distribuisse, et ex ea re cognomento vocatum esse Myrillam: nempe *ἀπὸ τοῦ μύρου Μύριλλαν*. Ego vero Eudæmonem illum jubeo *κρόμμυ' ἐσθίειν*, ut hominem infortunio mactem: siquidem religio erat Pelusiotis cepas gustare. Nam profecto de Syracusiorum dialecto cras credo, hodie nihil. Theocritus Syracusanus, qui idiomate vernaculo perpetuo est usus (*Μοῦσαν δ' ὀθνείην οὔποτ' ἐφειλκυσάμην*),[e] annon *Σ* literam ubique servat, *Δαμοίτας*, *Μενάλκας*, *Ἀμύντας*, *Διοκλείδας*? Non Apollo *Δαφνίτας* Syracusis colebatur? Non *Hicetas* Syracusius philosophus a Cicerone laudatur in *Academicis?* non eorum sermone *γαφάγας lumbricus* apud *Etymologicon?* non dissimulo apud Hesychium scriptum esse *Γαφάτα, σκώληξ·* sed vero duplici errore. Nam excidit *Σ* litera, ut usu venire solet, cum proxime subsequatur altera: *T* autem facillime mutatur in *Γ*, ut alibi *Στένυτρον, εὐρυπωδέστερον, συριγγῶδες·* pro *Στεννγρὸν, εὐριπῶδες, στενὸν, συριγγῶδες*. Ne ipse quidem Sophron aliter locutus est. Athenæus lib. vii.[f] *Καὶ παρὰ Σώφρονι ὁ θυννοθήρας·* et *καρχαρίας* aliquanto inferius p. 306.[g] *Σώφρων, θυννοθηραῖα δὲ γαστὴρ καρχαρίας ὁ κάτινος δῆσθε*. Priora verba, quæ Casaubono molestiam creabant, sic lege: *Σώφρων Θυννο-*

[d Eustath. ad *Odyss.* p. 1457. ed. Rom.—D.]

[e *Epig.* xxii.—D.] [f c. lxvi. t. iii. p. 108. ed. Schw.—D.]

[g c. lxxvi. t. iii. p. 121. ed. Schw., ubi *Σωφ., Θυννοθήρᾳ· Ἃ δὲ γαστ. ὑμέων καρχ. ὅκα τινὸς δῆσθε.*—De hoc loco vide Schw. *Animadv. in Ath.* t. iv. p. 278. ed. Lond.; Porson. *Advers.* p. 98.; Blomfield. in *Mus. Crit.* t. ii. p. 344.—D.]

θήραι· Ἁ δὲ γαστὴρ — id est, *Θυννοθήρᾳ*. Nimirum iste liber *Θυννοθήρας* inscriptus est. *Etymol.* in *Ἤϊα*. *Ὡς φησι Σώφρων ἐν Θυννοθήρᾳ*. Male alibi *ἐν Θυννοθήραις*. Quod si verum est illud de Democopo, vulgi joco cognomen suum adeptus esse videatur: quia fortassis ea tempestate Syracusis scorto cuipiam non ignobili nomen fuerit Myrilla. Nam mulieris id quidem nomen esse proprium certiores nos facit poeta nescio quis inter Lyricos H. Stephani. *Στρατόκλεις φίλος Κυθήρης, Στρατόκλεις φίλος Μυρίλλης, Ἴδε τὴν φίλην γυναῖκα, Κομάει, τέθηλε, λάμπει. Ῥόδον ἀνθέων ἀνάσσει, Ῥόδον ἐν κόραις Μυρίλλα.*[h] Quod ad *Κόπαινα* attinet, etsi non facile fidem habeam, viderit de eo verbo epigrammatis auctor, qui fortasse, cum barbarum Illyrium *βαρβαρίζοντα* induxerit, bene moratum carmen fecisse videatur. Quod siquis Illyriorum exemplo *Ἰωάννης ὁ Μαλέλα* proferre velit; id quidem perinde est, tanquam si *ὁ Κάτῳ* dicens et *ὁ Κίκερο*, se egregie loqui Græce contendat; quia apud Aristophanem Caris[i] cantilena est, *Θρεττανελὸ τὸν Κύκλωπα*·[j] et Scythæ istius Attica elegantia:

Ὡς ἐλαπρὸς, ὥσπερ ψύλλο κατὰ τὸ κώδιο·

et

Ὦ γράδι', ὡς καρίεντό σοι τὸ τυγάτριο,
Κοὐ δύσκολ', ἀλλὰ πρᾶο· ποῦ τὸ γρᾷδιο;[k]

Sed nimium diu, mi Milli, in litigiosa hac disputatione te demoratus sum. Dabis autem veniam necessitati; nam postea, per me licet, alii ut volent loquentur, non equidem invideo, neque intercedo. Imo enimvero invitissimus hæc scripsi,

Ὡς οὐχ ὑπάρχων, ἀλλὰ τιμωρούμενος.[l]

[h Anacr. *Od.* lxii. p. 229. ed. Fisch., ubi in v. 2. *ἄνερ* pro *φίλος*.—D.]

[i scil. Carionis.—*Καὶ τὸ Καρίων ἐξελληνιζόμενον τὸν δοῦλον δηλοῖ· Κᾶρες γὰρ οἱ δοῦλοι. Pluti Argum.*—D.]

[j *Plut.* 290. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[k *Thesm.* 1180. et 1210, 1211. ed. Bekk.—D.]

[l Apud Suidam (in *Ὡς οὐχ ὑπ.*) Chæremonis, apud Zenobium (vi. 51) Menandri, apud Athenæum (lib. xiii. t. v. p. 219. ed. Schw., ubi *Ταδ' οὐχ ὑπ.*) Aristarchi tragici hic versus esse perhibetur.—D.]

ADDENDA.

Ecce iterum Crispinus. Cum enim adhuc supersit chartæ aliquantulum, ut narrat typographus; nimirum ei parcere stulta, ut ait ille, foret clementia. Percurram igitur Epistolam totam, adnotaturus identidem, siqua vel retractari diligentius vel corrigi debeant.

Principio, bene quidem factum quod (pag. 246) de etymologia *τοῦ Ἡρικεπαίου* supersedi inquirere. Quamvis enim *Ἠρι* in Græcorum verborum compositione non infrequens sit, *Ἠριπόλη, ἠριγένεια, ἠριγέρων, ἠριθαλές*, nihilo tamen minus peregrinam esse vocem mihi videor certo comperisse. Siquidem *κεπ* syllaba, quod jure mireris, plane aliena est atque absona a consuetudine cum Græci tum Latini sermonis. *Σκεπ* quidem in *σκέπω, περισκεπὴς, σκέπαρνον*, &c., *κεπ* autem nusquam occurrit, quod sciam, præterquam in *Κέπφος*. Eam ego vocem, cum solitaria sit atque unica, vix dubito, quin olim pronunciaverint *Keffos*, non *Kepfos*: prout hodie *Σαπφὼ Saffo* dicimus, non *Sapfo*. Apud Latinos autem *κεπ* syllabam brevem frustra quæsiveris. *Conceptio, perceptio*, et similia, *κηπ* habent productam a *percépi, concépi*. *Anceps, auceps, princeps, κεψ* in scriptura exhibent, non *κεπ*: neque vero casibus obliquis faciunt *aucepis* aut *princepis*.

Ep. p. 255. Ut egomet vineta mea cædam, falso credidi tres istas Sophoclis fabulas ex una tetralogia fuisse, continuatione serieque historiæ in eam opinionem adductus. *Ἀλλ' οὐ πεσών γ' ἐκείμην.*[a] Culpa enim postridie deprehensa etiam amoveri facile potuit, si per typothetam licuisset. *Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν, ἀχνύμενοί περ.*[b] Certum est eas tragœdias longo interjecto intervallo fuisse editas. *Antigonen* ita placuisse ferunt, ut ea gratia prætura Sophocli

[[a] *Ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐγὼ μέντοι πεσών γε κείσομαι.* Aristoph. *Nub.* 127. ed. Bekk. —D.]

[[b] Hom. *Il.* xviii. 112., ubi *Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν, κ. τ. λ.*—D.]

decerneretur in bello adversus Samios. Ergo acta esse videtur anno III. Olymp. LXXXIV. ætatis Soph. LVI.[b] secundum Marmor Arundel. *Œdipus* vero *Tyrannus* secundas tantum obtinuit, et victus est a Philocle: quin et *Œdipum Coloneum*, quem extrema senectute fecit omnium novissimam, editionis tempore antecessit. Argumentum *Œd. Tyr.* *Εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ Πρότερον αὐτὸν, οὐ Τύραννον, ἐπιγράφοντες, διὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῶν διδασκαλιῶν, καὶ διὰ τὰ πράγματα.* Ita scribendus est iste locus, quem minus intellexit magnus Camerarius. Sunt qui hanc fabulam *Œdipum Priorem* inscribunt, non *Œd. Tyrannum;* quia prior erat cum tempore actionis, tum serie rerum gestarum. Ea hujus loci sententia est.

Ep. p. 258. vers. 8. Auget vehementer suspicionem nostram ipse Clemens in *Protreptico;* qui posteaquam versus eos tanquam Sophocleos protulit, *Οὗτοσὶ μὲν*, ait,[c] *ἤδη καὶ παρακεκινδυνευμένος ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῖς θεαταῖς παρεισήγαγεν.* Ergo et Clementis judicio in capitis venisset discrimen, quicunque eos olim in scenam detulisset. Ii alibi citantur hoc exemplo:[d]

Θνητοὶ δὲ πουλυκερδείᾳ πλανώμενοι
Ἱδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν,
Θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων τε καὶ ξύλων
Ἢ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ 'λεφαντίνων τύπους.

Quamobrem, quia nullus jam locus est censuræ nostræ in *πολλὸν* et *χαλκέων*, alia afferam argumenta oportet, cur subdititii sint. Multis sane nominibus non placet illud *πουλυκερδείᾳ*. Nam quid, obsecro, facit *πουλὺ* in tragœdiæ diverbio? est enim ex dialecto Ionica. Neque vero *δεια* spondæus in sede quarta ferri potest contra morem consue-

[[b] Vide Clintonum, *Fasti Hellen. from the* LV. *to the* CXXIV. *Olymp.* p. 57. sec. ed.—D.]

[[c] p. 63. ed. Pott., ubi . . . . *παρακεκινδυνευμένως.*—D.]

[[d] A Justino M., *Ad Græc. Cohort.* p. 14. ed. 1593., nisi quod pro *πουλυκερδείᾳ* ibi est *πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ.* Vide etiam Justinum, *De Mon.* p. 81., ed. 1593; Clementem, *Cohort. ad Gent.* p. 63. et *Strom.* p. 717. ed. Pott.; Theodoretum, *Græc. Aff. Cur.* p. 109. ed. 1692; Eusebium, *Præp. Evang.* p. 398., ed. 1544; Cyrillum *Contra Julian.* p. 32. ed. 1696.—D.]

tudinemque tragicorum. Theocritus: *Καὶ φιλοκερδείῃ βεβλαμμένον ἄνδρα παρελθεῖν.*[e] Neque porro *πουλυκερδεία* de *avaritia* possis accipere cum interprete Clementis: verum ea sententia nimium quidem inepta atque inficeta, quasi si *prudentia* sive *astutia* homines in errorem inciderint. *Πολυκέρδεια* enim est *πολυΐδρεια*· ut Ulysses Homericus:

Οὐκ ἔα εἰπέμεναι, πολυϊδρείῃσι νόοιο.[f]

Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἦν ἄλοχον πολυκερδείῃσιν ἄνωγε.[g]

Sed et alia fertur scriptura nihilo melior: *Θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι.* Mihi quidem, salvo aliorum judicio, *nos multi mortales,* parum ornate dici videtur pro elegantia *Ἀττικῆς μελίττης.* Sed utcunque de ea re visum fuerit eruditis: rogatos eos velim, qui luculenter Græce sciunt, utrum *καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι* domesticus sit sincerusque sermo Græcus, an potius peregrinus et *πονηροῦ κόμματος*? Nimirum suo se indicio prodidit Judæus iste sorex. Neque enim Hellenismus est, verum Hebraismus purus putus ex S. S. tralatus atque expressus. *Psalm.* xciv. (et *Epist. ad Hebræos*): *Ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδούς μου. Esaias* xxi.: *Ἡ καρδία μου πλανᾶται.* Imo enimvero negamus ista, *Ἡ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ ἐλεφαντίνων τύπους,* ab homine Græco nedum a Sophocle proficisci posse. *Τύπος* hoc in loco est ipsa statua, *αὐτὸ τὸ ἄγαλμα, οὐκ εἶδος τοῦ ἀγάλματος,* ut apud Isocratem in fine *Evagoræ: Τοὺς μὲν τύπους ἀναγκαῖον παρὰ τούτοις εἶναι παρ' οἷς ἂν σταθῶσι.*[h] Dicerent vero Græci *Ἡ χρυσοτεύκτους ἢ ἐλεφαντίνους τύπους Θεῶν,* non *χρυσοτεύκτων*· velut *εἰκόνας* dicunt *χαλκᾶς Ὀλυμπιονικῶν,* non *χαλκῶν.* Artemidorus:[i] *Χάλκεαι γὰρ εἰκόνες τῶν ἐλευθέρων ἀνατίθενται.* Ita passim et vulgo, ut quidem testimoniis uti putidissimum foret. Neque vero aliter Latini. Lucretius: *Si non aurea sunt juvenum simulacra per ædes,* non *aureorum.*[j] Plinius xxxiv. 7.: *Lignea*

[e *Idyl.* xvi. 63.—D.]
[f *Od.* xxiii. 77.—D.] [g *Od.* xxiv. 166., ubi Αὐτὰρ ὁ ἦν ἄλοχ.—D.]
[h *Or. Att.* t. ii. p. 275. ed. Bekk., ubi . . . . εἶναι μόνοις παρ'.—D.]
[i *Oneiroc.* lib. i. c. 50. p. 73. ed. Reiff., ubi Χάλκεοι, κ. τ. λ.—D.]
[j ii. 24.—D.]

potius aut fictilia deorum simulacra. Juvenalis: *Effigies sacri nitet aurea cercopitheci.*[k] Horatius: *Quid referam, quo pacto in imagine cerea Largior arserit ignis.*[l] Itaque τύπους ἐλεφαντίνων θεῶν nihil minus est quam Græca oratio: ea tamen utitur Sibylla lib. iii. ξυλίνων θεῶν εἴδωλα dicens pro ξύλινα·

Οἵτινες οὐκ ἀπάτῃσι κεναῖς, οὐδ' ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων,
Χρύσεα καὶ χάλκεια, καὶ ἀργύρου ἠδ' ἐλέφαντος,[m]
Καὶ ξυλίνων λιθίνων τε θεῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων,
Πήλινα, μιλτόχριστα, ζωγραφίας τυποειδεῖς,
Τιμῶσιν,[n] *ὅσα κέν τε βροτοὶ κενεόφρονι βουλῇ.*

Eadem habet *Protrepticus* Clementis. Quis porro inficiabitur in eodem doctos esse ludo subjectorem hunc Oraculorum, et commentitium illum Hecatæum? Quod si vicero de versibus falso Sophocli attributis, etiam illud evidentissime constabit, quod olim Philo Herennius et patrum memoria Jos. Scaliger suspicati sunt: nempe librum illum *De Judæis,* qui sub Hecatæi nomine ferebatur, a Judæo quodam Hellenista fuisse confictum: velut Aristeam illum pari facinore, quem supposititium esse convincunt post eundem Scaligerum alii bene multi, in quibus omnium doctissime et copiosissime Humfredus Hodius,[o] cui multum olim debebit Historia Ecclesiastica.

Ep. p. 284. *Εὐηρότατον.*) Suidas in *Lexico: Εὐηρότατον, τὸ καλὴν ἔχον γῆν, τὸ κάλλιστον τῆς γῆς. Εὐήροτον, τὸ καλῶς ἠροτριωμένον.* Vides eum utrumque vocabulum agnoscere, εὐηρότατον quidem comparativum, absolutum vero εὐήροτον. Quid igitur fiet? An supplex ad Hesychium adeam, pacem ejus oratum et peccati veniam? Imo enim satis ostendunt

[k xv. 4.—D.]

[l *Serm.* I. viii. 40. sqq., ubi "Singula quid *memorem?* quo pacto alterna, &c.
. . . . . .
. . . . . *et* imagine," &c. D.]

[m In hoc versu Clementem (*Cohort. ad Gent.* p. 60. ed. Pott.) secutus est Bentleius. Vulgo . . . . καὶ ἀργύρε' ἠδ' ἐλέφαντα: vide *Sibyll. Orac.* p. 264. ed. Obsop.—D.]

[n Sic Clemens. Vulgo Τιμῶντες.—D.]

[o In *Dissert. contra Historiam Aristeæ de* LXX. *Interpretibus,* 1684.—D.]

ea verba et mendi vetustatem, et emendationis meæ præstantiam. Quippe, nisi ego plane desipio, sic in comparatione dicendum esset, *Εὐήροτον, εὐηροτώτερον, εὐηροτώτατον.* Quod si reponere velis *Εὐηροτώτατον* apud Suidam, jam ea vox inverso ordine post *Εὐήροτον* collocanda esset. Ergo quocunque te vertas, hallucinatio Suidæ est, qui sine dubio sua male confinxit ex Hesychianis, vel ex illis unde sua transtulit Hesychius.

Ibidem. *Ἄντινι, ἀντιδιενέγμεθα.*) Liquido possis dejerare, Hesychium scripsisse *ἄντινι*, id enim series literarum efflagitat; et illud *ἀντιδι* ex correctore natum esse, qui *κακῷ κακὸν ἰάσατο.* Scriptura a prima manu fuit in hunc modum: *Ἀντιηνέγμεθα, ἠναντιώμεθα.* Hesychius autem, qui, ut videtur, non leviter tum lippiebat, sic legit et scripsit: *Ἀντινινέγμεθα· νι* et *η* paulum oppido inter se differunt, et facillima sane erratio est. Nihil hac conjectura probabilius dici potest. *Ἀντιηνέγμεθα* ab *ἀντιφέρομαι, ἠναντιώμεθα.* Ipse Hesych.: *Ἀντιφέρεται, ἐναντιοῦται,* et *Ἀντιφέρεσθαι . . . ἐναντιοῦσθαι·* et Suidas: *Ἀντιφέρονται, ἐναντιοῦνται.* Sed *Ἀντιδιαφέρομαι* nusquam lego.

Ep. p. 301. v. 10. *Πέπλους τε νῆσαι λινοπλυνεῖς τ' ἐπενδύτας.*) vox ea bifariam accipi potest. Aut *νῆσαι* erit *ὑφάναι·* quemadmodum *πέπλοι εὔνητοι* ab Homero vocantur, *Ἔνθ' ἐνὶ πέπλοι Λεπτοὶ εὔνητοι βεβλήατο, ἔργα γυναικῶν·*[p] qui a Sophocle *εὐϋφεῖς* vocantur in *Trachiniis*:[q] *Ὅπως φέρεις μοι τόνδε γ' εὐϋφῆ πέπλον.* Aut erit *νῆσαι, σωρεῦσαι,* accumulare vestem, in arcis reponere, ut mos erat antiquorum. Homerus:

Ὡς φάτ'· ὁ δ' ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσατο πατρὸς
Εὐρὺν, ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο,
Ἐσθῆς τ' ἐν χηλοῖσιν, ἅλις τ' εὐῶδες ἔλαιον.[r]

Et alibi:

———*Ἑλένη δὲ παρίστατο φωριαμοῖσιν,*
Ἔνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιλοι, οὓς κάμεν αὐτή.[s]

[p *Od.* vii. 96.—D.]
[r *Od.* ii. 337., ubi *Ὡς φάν.*—D.
[q v. 603. ed. Erf., ubi *φέρῃς.*—D.]
[s *Od.* xv. 104.—D.]

Possis etiam, et magis quidem apposite ad nomen tragœdiæ *Πλυντρίας, νίψαι* reponere, *Lavato*, &c.

Πέπλους τε νίψαι λινοπλυνεῖς τ' ἐπενδύτας.

Epist. p. 320. v. 5. adde: Idem Hesychius: *Κυδρὸς, ἔνδοξος, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, γαυριῶν, πεποιθῶν* * *εὐρύτιδις συγκοπὸν δὲ τοῦ κύδρος Καλλίστρατος πεποιθώς.* Nunquam quidquam vidi inquinatius: lege *γαυριῶν, πεποιθὼς, Ἴων Εὐρυτίδαις. συγκοπῇ δὲ τοῦ ῥ̄ κῦδος. Καλλίστρατος*· verbum enim novissimum *πεποιθὼς* est emendatio *τοῦ πεποιθῶν.* Vide Ep. pag. 284, 285, 291. Et Callistratus quidem *κῦδος* a *κυδρὸς* deducit *συγκοπῇ τοῦ ῥ̄*· alii vicissim *κυδρὸς* a *κῦδος* derivant *ἐπενθέσει τοῦ ῥ̄. Etym. Magn. Κῦδος, κυδότερος, κυδότατος, ... πλεονασμῷ δὲ τοῦ ῥ̄ γίνεται κυδρός.*

Ep. p. 343. v. 3. adde: Martianus Capella lib. iii. cap. *De Analogia*:[t] "*Æneas, Pythagoras, Lycas* faciunt *Æneæ, Pythagoræ, Lycæ.* Quando nostra ratione nomina, quæ genitivo in E exeunt, nominativo A finiuntur; ut *Catilinæ Catilina.* Sed hæc Græca sunt, ideo in nominativo S literam retinent. Quædam tamen perdunt S literam in nominativo, ut *Nicæa, Medæa.* Ergo in his nominativis consuetudo servanda est." Ubi legendum est *Nicia* et *Demea.* Vide Ep. pag. 348.

Ep. p. 339. v. 26. Sed nusquam alibi tam frequens earum vocalium inter se permutatio est, quam in 2 Codd. MSS. longe antiquissimis; ALEXANDRINO uno in Bibliotheca Regia, qui integra exhibet *Biblia* et *Epistolas S. Clementis ad Corinthios;* Cantabrigiensi autem altero, mutilo quidem et decurtato; quippe qui *Acta* duntaxat habeat et *Evangelistas;* verum idem e regione ostentat interpretationem veterem Latinam ad verbum de Græco expressam, dignissimam sane quæ ex oblivione atque tenebris tandem aliquando in lucem edatur. Servantur etiam Oxonii *Acta Apostolorum,* vetustate quidem pari, sed versione multum diversa; et in Gallia denique *Epistolæ S. Pauli,* qui codex et antiquitate et Latina

[[t] p. 77. ed. Grot., ubi "Tertia [species], ut Æneas, Pythagoras, Lycas: *nam facit* Æneæ," &c.—D.]

versione atque adeo scripturæ et voluminis forma Cantabrigiensi nostro simillimus est et germanissimus. Atque hæc quidem talia exemplaria, cum aliis omnibus ubivis gentium, quod sciamus, longe longeque et dignitate et tempore antecedant, neque quidquam hodie supersit simile aut secundum, cum tineis (pro dolor!) atque muribus luctantur, et utut iis incendia pepercerint, ipso senio intra annos paucos non dubie peritura sunt. Tu vero, Milli doctissime, qui omnium mortalium maxime in eo studio versatus es, non patieris hanc laudem tibi præripi; sed maturabis veneranda illa pignora et monumenta vetustatis a situ et interitu vindicare. Scimus enim te horum omnium editionem instituere, quæ una pagina et in uno conspectu Codicem Alex., qui familiam ducet, et Cantabrigiensem cum versione sua, atque ubi hic deficit, Oxoniensem deinceps atque Gallicum repræsentet: quæ singulas literas atque apices exemplarium, etiam ubi a librariis peccatum est, accurate et religiose subsequatur. Nihil illi purpuræ assuetur discolor aut diversum; nullæ interpunctiones, nullæ notæ accentuum, quorum omnis hodie ratio præpostera est atque perversa: adeo ut qui tuam editionem sibi comparaverit, ipsa illa propemodum archetypa versare manibus atque oculis usurpare videatur. Ea res olim, ut certum est augurium, et Britanniæ nostræ splendori erit, et Ecclesiæ præsidio: tuos vero utique labores amplissimis præmiis atque immortali gloria compensabit. Macte ista pietate et diligentia esto. In te omnes ora atque oculos convertimus, te unum in hoc curriculum vocamus: ipsi codices celerem tuam opem implorant et flagitant: quid cessas per medias laudes et faventium plausus secundo rumore ingredi? Tu vero, ut polliceri de te possum, facies id sedulo; simulatque exibit *Novum* tuum *Testamentum*, jam fere ad umbilicum usque perductum:[u] quo in opere, nisi vererer coram in os te laudare, dicerem quam longo intervallo aliorum omnium in eo genere labores post te reliqueris. Ea typorum elegantia est et magnificentia; ea in anno-

[[u] Prodiit demum Oxonii, anno 1707.—D.]

tationibus eruditio elucet, in variis lectionibus industria: quippe etenim ad eam copiam comparandam omnia S. Patrum scripta, omnes antiquas versiones, et infinitam vim Codd. MSS. curiose excussisti. Enimvero mihi stomachum subinde movent imperiti quidam homines et nullo usu bonarum literarum præditi, qui omnem operam, quæ in variis lectionibus colligendis impenditur, aut inutilem esse existimant, aut Ecclesiæ periculosam. Eorum ego sermones, quanquam indigni sunt quorum ulla ratio habeatur, uno in præsentia exemplo retundam: quo perspicuum erit minuta quædam et prima utique specie levissima posse magnas difficultates expedire. Locus est cap. iv. in *Ep. ad Galatas*, qui ab ineunte fere Christianismo usque ad hanc memoriam doctissimos viros exercuit. 22. *Γέγραπται γὰρ, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν· ἕνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἕνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας.* 23. *Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται· ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας, διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.* 24. *Ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν αἱ δύο διαθῆκαι· μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ.* 25. *Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, συστοιχεῖ δὲ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει δὲ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.* 26. *Ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν.* Memini equidem, Milli, me non ita pridem a te rogatum, ut de perdifficili hoc loco judicium meum interponerem, vehementer approbasse sententiam tuam, quam in illa tua editione posuisti: neque enim eundem montem et Agarem vocatum esse et Sinam, neque vero ullum usquam gentium eo nomine notatum esse, neque porro Agarem servam (si de serva malit quispiam, quam de monte accipere) in eadem allegoria et monti respondere posse, et legi quæ ex monte promulgata est: atque his de causis in diversa consilia itum esse ab antiquis, quorum alii *Σινᾶ*, sed plures *Τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ*, e libris sustulerunt: quæ autem nostra et patrum memoria viri magni commentati sunt, tantum abesse ut locum faciant explicatiorem, ut novis etiam obscuritatibus involvant. Qua quidem occasione, ne omnino *ἀσύμβολος* essem, conjecturam, ut scis, extempo-

ralem in medium attuli, quæ etiam tum visa est ad veritatem proxime accedere. Scilicet e regione verbi Σινᾶ adnotasse olim quempiam enarrationis causa, Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, *Sina iste, quem memorat Apostolus, mons Arabiæ est;* ea autem verba non multo post, ut sæpe usu venit, de libri margine in orationem ipsam irrepsisse: nam Apostoli quidem ea non esse, sed παρεμβεβλημένα, ex ipso statim vultu et colore totiusque adeo corporis filo cognosci posse: et proinde me paratum esse ὀβελίζειν hunc locum, nisi quid tibi secus videretur. Cum autem tibi valde placere conjecturam meam præ te ferres: atqui, inquam, ut vera ista sit sive opinio sive adeo suspicio nostra, necesse est illud δὲ quod vocem συστοιχεῖ proxime subsequitur, pro supervacaneo auferatur. Dictum ac factum editionem tuam inspicimus, ibique quatuor ad minimum MSS. libros comperimus conjunctionem istam non agnoscere: quod sane non de nihilo est, neque ulla commode ratio reddi potest cur abfuerit; si verba, de quibus hæc quæstio est, nunquam non in codicibus extitissent. Tanta res tam tenui[v] indicio patefacta satis refellit voculas imperitorum aut malevolorum hominum, qui diligentiam istam minutas scripturæ varietates sectantem, tanquam obscuram et sollicitam et nimiam in vituperationem adducunt. Quis enim dubitet quin melior multo et apertior fiat sententia, si auctoritate manuscriptorum expungatur δέ· tum autem Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ de medio discedant; et totus deinde locus sic legatur: Ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα· αὗται γάρ εἰσιν αἱ δύο διαθῆκαι· μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρους Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἄγαρ. Τὸ δὲ Ἄγαρ συστοιχεῖ τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς· hoc est, *Agar autem respondet Hierosolymis, serviunt enim cum progenie sua.* Γὰρ et δὲ locum inter se permutare jussi fide MS. Alexandrini, et aliorum: quinetiam dedita opera *Hierosolyma* dixi non *Ierusalem;* ut ex ipsa dictione foret perspicuum, quorsum illud δουλεύει pertineret. Ipsa enim flagitat sententia ut δου-

[v Ed. Oxon. *Epist. ad Mill.* "pertenui."—D.]

λεύει referatur ad Ἱερουσαλήμ. Quod cum ita sit; cur, amabo, Apostolus tali usus est constructione verborum, qua δουλεύει cum Ἄγαρ necessario convenire videatur? aut quamobrem τὸ Ἄγαρ genere neutro posuit; quasi vero Ἄγαρ materialiter ac pro voce, non pro ancilla, hic usurpetur? Hactenus opinor prospere mihi conjectura processit, ut mons iste Arabiæ omnibus machinis loco movendus esse videatur: sed male vero me habent hi scrupuli, neque aliud habeo quod dicam aut conjectem; præterquam ex quo tempore verba ista de margine in orationis textum adscita sunt, sicuti mox conjunctionem δὲ quosdam homines intrusisse, ita alia nonnulla mutavisse leviter et ad commentitiam eam sententiam accommodasse. Nam profecto facile animum induco, ut credam hoc modo scripsisse S. Paulum: Τῇ δὲ Ἄγαρ συστοιχεῖ ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ τέκνων αὐτῆς. Ἡ δὲ ἄνω, &c. *Agari autem respondet Ierusalem, servit enim cum liberis suis. Quæ vero supra est Ierusalem, libera est, quæ mater est omnium nostrum:* postea vero adulterina ista sese insinuasse hoc exemplo, Τῇ δὲ Ἄγαρ Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ συστοιχεῖ ἡ νῦν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Cum autem hæc oratio, ut cernis, in manifestum solœcismum cadat, simile sane vero est, ne dicam necessarium, verba ista τῇ et ἡ sic brevi a scribis immutatum iri, quemadmodum hodie vulgo feruntur. Quis enim non incuset *imperitiam notariorum librariorumque incuriam,* ut S. Hieronymi[w] verbis utar, *qui scribunt, non quod inveniunt, sed quod intelligunt; et dum alienos errores emendare nituntur, ostendunt suos?* Vale.

[[w] *Epist. ad Lucinium,—Opp.* t. iv. p. ii. p. 578. ed. 1693—1706.—D.]

INDEX

RERUM MEMORABILIUM, ET SCRIPTORUM

QUI IN

EPISTOLA RICHARDI BENTLEII

EMENDANTUR.

ÆSCHYLUS emend., 317, 341.
Æschyli Schol. notatus, 340.
Αι et ε eodem sono efferuntur, 287, 339.
Αἴτια Callimachi, 334.
Allatius not., 307.
Ὁ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γράψας, 265.
Anapæstorum ratio nunc demum observata, 274.
Antimachus Colophonius, 251, 323.
Judæus Apella, 345.
Apollodorus em., 265.
Aristophanes com. em., 268.
Arist. Schol. not., 267, 270, 280; em., 308, 311, 325.
Aristoph. grammat. em., 260.
ΑΣ terminationem ubi servent Latini in Græcis vertendis, ubi mutent, 342, &c.
Athenæus em., 251, 309, 311, 314, 319, 326, 330, 354.
Attius poeta trag. em., 275, 276.
Auleas commentitius tragicus pro Æschylo, 299, 331.
Βέδυ, ζάμψ, χθὼ, πλῆκτρον, σφὶγξ, 302.
Βόττιος, Βούττιος, Βώττιος, apud Malelam pro Βρούττιος, 334.
Camerarius not., 357.
Casaubonus Is. not., 301, 309, 314, 315, 326, 354.
Κεπ syllaba neque Græca neque Latina, 356.
Cicero em., 276.
Clemens Alex. em. et explic., 301, 302.
Clodius Neapolitanus, 304.
Κναξζθὶ, χθύπτης, φλεγμὼ, δρὸψ, 302.
Creophylus poeta scripsit Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσιν, 321, 322.
Damascius περὶ ἀρχῶν MS. em., 243, 244.
Demarchus apud Mal. pro Dinarcho, 335.
Demetrii com. fabula Σικελία, 290.
Dinarchus poeta, 335, 336.
Dionysius Halic. em., 335, 336.
Domninus chron., 336.
Empedocles em., 340.
Ennius em., 296, 297.
Ἐπίγονοι Homeri poema, vel Antimachi Colophonii, 322, 323.
Epigramma falso inscriptum, 309; em., 334.
Ἑπταεπάκτιος Homeri poema, 322, 323, 324.
Erasmus not., 267.
Erotianus em., 273.
Etymolog. M. not., 340; em., 312, 325, 355.
Eudæmon Pelusiota not., 354.
Euphorion em., 318.
Euripidis *Danae*, 259; em., 261.
[——— *Antiopa*, 261.]
Ἀλκμαίων ὁ διὰ Ψωφῖδος, 263.
Sthenebœa em., 267.
Κρῆτες, 269; em., 277.
Hippolytus διεσκευασμένος, 280.
[*Meleager*, 284.]
Iphigenia in Tauris em., 295.
——— in Eurip. tragœdiis perperam ponuntur
Pasiphae, 269.
et *Europa*, 297.
Euripidis Schol. em., 266.
Eustathius em., 312.
Ἡρικεπαῖος deus Orphicus, 243, 356.
Fulgentius Planc. not. et em., 334, 335.
Galenus em., 315, 316, 317, 318.
Gatakerus not., 301.
Grotius not., 259, 267, 271, 274, 327, 328.
Gruteri *Inscriptiones* not. et em., 344, 346, 347.
Gyraldus not., 305.

Hamartolus em., 298.
Harpocration em., 329, 330.
Hecatæus Abderita *De Judæis* a Judæo quodam Hellenista confictus, 257, 359.
Hesiodus em., 320.
Hesiodi et Homeri Certamen em., 323.
Hesychius em., 260, 264, 282, 283, 290, 310, 311, 312, 320, 324, 327, 340, 341, 354, 361.
Hesychii hallucinationes, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 303, 311, 312, 313, 327, 359, 360.
In Hesychio *παρεμβεβλημένα* quædam, 284, 285, 291, 361.
Homerus em., 339.
Horatius explicatur, 345, 346.
Joannes Malelas: vide Malelas.
Ionis Chii poetæ tragici ætas et scripta, 304 et seqq. copiose.
Ion Rhapsodus apud Platonem alius a Chio, 305, 306.
Jonsius not., 306.
Liberatus Diaconus em., 353.
Lucretius em., 295.
Magnetis comici fabulæ, 283.
——— *Λυδοὶ διεσκευασμένοι*, 283.
Malelas sive Malalas in casu recto, non Malela, 342 et seqq.
Malelas em., 243, 246, 247, 248, 255, 256, 261, [298], 299, [304], 333, 334.
explic., 269, 297, 333.
castig., 262, 283, 293, 294, 296, 298, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339.
Μάρπτε, σφίγξ, κλῶψ, ζβυχθηδὸν, 302.
Martianus Capella em., 361.
Menagius not., 305, 306, 321.
Meursius not., 293, 301.
Μῆτις deus Orphicus, 243.
Minos commentitius trag. pro Ione, 299.
Nicias poeta em., 269.
Nonius Marcellus em., 275, 345.
Νωπεῖσθαι vox Ionica, 327.
Οι et *υ* inter se permutantur, 339.
Omphale Ionis Chii fab. satyrica, 313, 314, 315.
Oracula subdititia Gr. Philosophorum ex MSto hic edita et em., 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254.
Orpheus em., 242, 246, 247, 248.
S. Pauli locus in *Ep. ad Galatas* em. et exp., 363, 364, 365.
Pausanias em., 321.
Photii Patriarchæ *Lex. Gr. MS.*, 260, 267, 287, 312, 321, 327; em., 261, 283.
Plinius em., 278, 344.
Plutarchus em., 259, 268, 340.
Pollux em., 260, 267, 287, 292, 301, 310, 317, 340.
Porphyrius em., 277; ejus Fragmentum de *Κναξζβὶ*, &c. ex MS. editum et em., 303, 304.
Priscianus not., 353.
Priscus Thrax de bello cum Attila, 350.
Proclus *In Parmenidem* MS., 244.
Prosper in *Chronico* em., 350.
Φάνης deus Orphicus, 243.
Quintilianus not., 345.
Julius Rufinianus em., 296, 297.
Salmasius not., 303.
Σαλμωνεὺς Sophoclis fabula satyrica, 318, 319.
Σάτυροι pro fabula satyrica, 260, 315.
Scaliger Jos. not., 267, 274, 335, 344.
Scal. Jul. not., 305.
Solinus em., 278.
Sophocles em., 301, 316, 317, 318.
Sophoclis locus commentitius, 256, 357, 358.
Sophoclis Schol. em., 320, 321; explic., 357.
Sophronis liber *Θυννοθήρας*, 355.
Henr. Stephanus not., 340.
Strabo em., 315.
Suidas em., [261], 308, 322, 323, 324, 325, 331, 350; not., 307, 328, 359.
Novi TESTAMENTI editio gemina a Cl. V. Jo. Millio procuranda, 362.
Thales apud Malelam pro Thallo, 334.
Θεμερῶπις, 340.
Theognoti *Canones de Orthographia MS. Gr.*, 341.
Theodosii *Epitoma τῆς Καθόλου* Herodiani MS., 289.
Theomis tragicus falso appellatus pro Thespide, 299.
Theophanes em., 350, 353.
Theophrastus em., 279.
Thespis, 300; em., 301.
Τριαγμοὶ Ionis liber, vel Epigenis, vel Orphei, 330, 331.
Tzetzis *Interpretatio Homeri Allegorica MS.* em., 323.
Varro em., 345.
Vossius Ger. not., 296, 306, 321, 335, 348.

INDEXES

TO THE

DISSERTATIONS UPON THE EPISTLES

OF

PHALARIS, THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES, AND THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

INDEX

TO THE

DISSERTATION UPON PHALARIS.

A.

ABARIS the Hyperborean, age of, 115, 116; his acquaintance with Phalaris, ii. 96, 97, 109.

Adimantus, when archon, 109, 110, 305, 306.

Adrastus, tragical choruses in honour of his memory, 332, 339.

Ægineans, their money, 387—389.

Ælian quoted, 232; refuted, 310; corrected, 374; solecisms of, 363.

Æneidos, a mistake for Æneis, 59.

Æsara, daughter of Pythagoras, her name retrieved, 422.

Æschylus quoted, 191, 192, 193, 194; corrected, 198, 199; his improvement of tragedy, 282; one of the first to introduce the new or serious tragedy, 294, 321; added a second actor, 300, 324; believed by many to have added also the third, 325; aspired after the sublime character, 343; inventor of scenery and other stage-ornaments, 393, 394, 402; number of his plays, 325; his age, 394; date of his first victory, 403.

Æsop, a slave, made apologues at Samos, ii. 92.

Agamemnon, not a play of Seneca's, 203.

Agatharchides, a Samian historian, 372.

Agatharchus, the first painter of scenes, 393, 394.

Agathocles, 160.

Agathyrsides, a mistake for Agatharchides, 372.

Agrigentum, why called both maritime and inland, 157; its situation, 163; its language, 357; its population, ii. 80.

Αι and ε anciently pronounced alike, 328.

Αἰγᾶν, a false reading for αἰγῶν, 35.

Αἰὲς and ἀεὶ, whether both used by the Cretans, 373.

Αιευς and αιατης, adjectives in, formed from substantives in αια, not in η, 369.

Αισι for αις, ii. 8.

Ἀκμῇ, import of, 123; of Pythagoras, why brought so low by Christian writers, 133.

Ἄκουε, σίγα, 254.

Ἀκούετε, λεὼς, 253, 254.

Alæsa, a town in Sicily, 164—169; when and by whom built, 164, 236; its situation, 165, 166.

Alcæus the poet, a native of Lesbos, 374; quoted, 415.

Alcman, age of, 107.

Aldobrandinus refuted, 125.

Alexander Ephesius quoted, 174.

Alexias, when archon, 400.

Alexis quoted, 182, 183; corrected, 182; his violation of chronology, 183.

Aliene, the word defended, 54.

Ἄλκηστις, a play of Thespis, a mistake, 289—291, 298.

Allegory, use of, defended, 230.

Alphabet, Greek, not perfected in Thespis's time, 291; consisted of only eighteen letters in that of Solon, ii. 7; letters said to have been added, and by whom, 292; ii. 7; how before expressed, 292.

Aluntium, 164—166.

Ἄμ for ἂν, ii. 62, 63.

Amasis, king of Egypt, 128.

Ἀμὲ, Doric for ἐμὲ, 397.

Amorphus, false reading for Phormis, 252.

Αν never put by the Dorians for ων in the gen. pl. of the third declension, 36.

Anapæstic verse, 190—204; last syllable of, not common, 190; never

ends in a tribrach, trochee, or cretic, in the Greek poets, 190; only twice in a trochee in Seneca, 203; exceptions to this rule mere mistakes of copiers, 198; all passages containing them in the Greek drama quoted and corrected, 198—201; those in Seneca quoted, 202, 203; the rule frequently violated by modern writers, 190, 203.

Anaxagoras, age of, 322; acquainted with Themistocles, 323; with Pericles, ii. 83.

Anaxandrides, chronology violated in plays of, 183.

Anaxilas, king of Rhegium, age of, 205, 206, 210, 217, 402; takes Zancle from the Samians, 205, 211, 218; first changes its name to Messana, 205, 207, 208, 210, 221, 222; invites Hamilcar into Sicily, 212; his war with the Locrians, *ib.*; his victory at Olympia, 213, 214; a saying of, 209; his death, 222, 402; his sons, when and by whom driven out of Messana, 222.

Anaximenes the historian, his forgery upon his rival Theopompus, 87.

Andromachus, a Tauromenite, settles the old Naxians in Taurominium, 233; father of Timæus the Sicilian historian, ii. 104.

Andronicus Rhodius, his paraphrase of Aristotle's Ethics, its genuineness doubtful, 373; quoted, ii. 106.

Ἀνδροφόνος, ii. 5.

Annius of Viterbo, his forgery, 84.

Ανος for ἄνθρωπος, ii. 20.

Ἀντιδημιουργήσασθαι, import of, 185.

Ἀντιγονίδας, from nom. sing. in ις, not ιδης, 186.

Antimachus, saying of, 178.

Antisthenes, founder of the sect of Cynics, 64.

Ἀπήνη, a chariot of mules, why impressed on some coins of the Messenians, 213; when and by whom first used at the Olympic games, 214, 215; when put down, *ibid.*; the same as ἅμαξα, *plaustrum*, 258.

Aphepsion, or Apsephion, when archon, 328.

Ἀπίλλειν, afterwards ἀποκλείειν, import of, ii. 6.

Ἀποφρὰς, ii. 9.

Aratus, an epic poet, 418.

Arcadius the grammarian quoted, ii. 67, 73.

Archagetas, surname of Apollo, tutelar god of the Naxians, 239.

Archebolion, a false reading for Archilochium, 276; a mistake for Archebulion, 278.

Archebulion, verse so called, different from the Saturnian, 278; examples thereof, 278, 279.

Archestratus the Syracusan corrected and explained, 149—151.

Archilochus quoted, 278; corrected, 341; his Iambics, 248, 249; only two of those now extant are proverbial sentences, 249; not understood by the vulgar in the time of Oppian, ii. 13; Archilochian verse the same with the Saturnian, 278.

Architeles, ii. 122.

Archytas of Tarentum, a Pythagorean, preceptor to Plato, 148, 149, 151.

Aretine, Francis, his Latin version of Phalaris's Epistles, ii. 15, 16.

Arion Methymnæus, pretended inventor of the dithyramb, 341.

Aristæus, successor of Pythagoras, age of, 146.

Aristeas, his story of the Septuagint a clumsy forgery, 84.

Aristocles the Cydonian, his statue of Hercules, 220.

Aristolochium and Aristodolium, false readings for Archilochium, 276.

Aristolochus, a tragic poet never heard of, 274—278.

Aristophanes quoted, 112, 192, 194, 282, 311, 312, 313, 314, 335, 346, 348, 399, 414; ii. 95; corrected, 201, 313, 316, 344, 345, 346; explained, 311, 312, 313, 316, 342, 343; ii. 75; date of his Plutus, 179; of his Ranæ, 261, 265; of his Aves, 265; prolegomena to, quoted and corrected, 349, 350; curious oration of his in Plato's Symposium, ii. 23; Scholiast on, his passage on Phalaris spurious, 92, 93.

Aristophanes the grammarian, his Διδασκαλίαι, 248.

Aristophon, when archon, ii. 118.

Aristotle quoted, 247, 248, 351; ii. 48, 60, 67, 106; corrected, 311, 408; defended, ii. 35; works forged in his name, 85; when set up his school at Athens, 145; made laws for the Abderitans, ii. 91; Phalaris's Epistles unknown in his age, ii. 106; his successors, 148.

Aristoxenus, no Pythagorean, 421.

Arrian quoted, 236.

Arundel Marble quoted and appealed to, 61, 109, 111, 256, 281, 289, 290, 296, 338, 349, 353, 373; ii. 63, 92; readings of, restored and explained, 112, 258, 259, 290, 291, 296; its authority questioned, 107—112; defended, 296—303; emendations of, rejected, 256, 257; in noticing the victories of tragedians, never gives the name of the play, 291; records only their first victories, 306, 307.
As of accusatives plural short in Doric, 195; ii. 62.
As, Roman, its metal and value, ii. 46, 53; its divisions, ii. 73; the same as the libra, ii. 53, 73.
Asandrastus, a mistaken name, 215.
Asinus ad Lyram, ii. 81.
Aspasius quoted, ii. 106, 125.
Asson, a mistake for Assos, 59.
Ἀστυπάλαια, not Ἀστυπάλη, 369.
Astypalæa, place of that name meant in the Epistles, 169; no city of Crete, 168, 169, 357, 366—371; ii. 80; an island of the Sporades, 169, 357, 369; ii. 88; colonised by the Megarians, 359; not the birthplace of Phalaris, 366; its language, 371.
Ἀθάνατον ὀργὴν ἔχειν, &c. 246—266; the phrase from whom borrowed, 247, 248, 262, 263; its date, 248—266.
Athenæus quoted, 121, 170, 174—176, 180, 181, 184, 185, 186, 284, 312, 345, 351, 391, 398, 418; ii. 121; corrected, 150, 151, 285, 287, 288, 391, 397; explained, 64, 150, 174, 180, 182, 185, 398, 405; defended, 64, 178—185.
Ἀθήνῃσι, not ἐν Ἀθήναις, 256, 257; not ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι, 413.
Athenians anciently the same people with the Ionians, 358; colonies of, *ibid.*; when invaded Sicily, 223; when defeated there, 410; their hatred to the Ægineans, 387—389; send an embassy to Macedonia for the ashes of Euripides, ii. 85; erect a cenotaph to his memory, *ibid.*
Athens, the μέτοικοι, or strangers of, their number and occupation, 185.
Atossa, the Persian empress, invented epistles, ii. 125—129; eaten by her son Xerxes, ii. 125; her age, ii. 125, 126.
Αττελεβώδης, ἀττέλεβος, 150.
Attic dialect, 355—430; the favourite dialect of the Sophists, 355; solecisms in, affected by them, 355, 362; examples of these, 363; not yet in fashion in the time of Phalaris, 355, 428; no Attic prose then but Draco's and Solon's laws, *ibid.*; why adopted by several Dorian authors, 360, 371—430; originally the same with the Ionic, ii. 7; changes in, ii. 2—13; three sorts of, within 200 years, ii. 8; causes of its changes, ii. 9—11.
Attic, New, ii. 1—31; not in use in the days of Phalaris, ii. 1, 3; words in the Epistles in a sense peculiar thereto, ii. 2.; distinction of, from the Old, common in Greek writers, ii. 9.
Attica, number of its inhabitants in the time of Demetrius Phalereus, ii. 9.
Αὐτομέλινα explained, 397.
Αὐτὸς ἔφα, 379.
Αὐτοσχεδιάσματα, import of, 325; first gave rise to tragedy, *ibid.*
Αὐτοσχεδιαστικὰ, import of, 332.

B.

Bacchic hymn, what meant thereby, 340, 341.
Bacchus and the Satyrs the subjects of all tragedies before the time of Phrynichus and Æschylus, 321; three choruses of, 283, 349; when celebrated, 283.
Bacchylides got his livelihood by the Muses, ii. 81.
Βάκχαις, Βραγχία, Βακχία, 288.
Βακχεῖα, false reading for Βακχεία, 288.
בנות, *banoth*, daughters, ii. 18.
ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΦΙΝΤΙΑ, import of, 161.
Beech-tree, the, lopping fatal to, 231.
Bellerophontes, the writings he carried from Argos to Lycia, not epistles, ii. 127, 128.
Bennet, Mr., bookseller, mistatements of, refuted, 7—23.
Bentley, Dr., personal charges against, examined and answered, 1—42; respecting the MS. of Phalaris, 1—23; respecting the MS. of Albertus Rubenius, 27—40; respecting the Alexandrian MS., 40. Complaints against his Dissertation answered, 42—73; against his pedantry, 52—68; causes that delayed his edition of Manilius, 39; his works all published at the desire

of others, 56; time spent by him in writing his first Dissertation, 68; his Notes on Callimachus, 69; his candour in producing a passage from an unpublished MS. that makes against himself, 254; his Fragments of Callimachus printed before any part of his Dissertation was written, 270; has no desire to have his Dissertation in Latin, *ibid.*; frankly confesses an error, ii. 25, 26; does not write books for fame, ii. 27.
Berosus, a forgery, 88.
Bes, ii. 66.
Bias, a preceptor of Pythagoras, 124.
Βινεῖν, afterwards βιδάσασθαι, import of, ii. 6.
Bis terque, import of, 197.
Books, forgery of, in fashion at the time of the Attali and the Ptolemies, 82, 85, 86, 383; motives that led thereto, 82, 83; instances of, 83, 84, 86, 87.
Boxhornius deceived by a forged poem, 91.
Boyle, Mr., his Preface to Phalaris's Epistles quoted, 1, 46, 78; charges Dr. Bentley with want of courtesy, 1, &c. 40, &c.; with meanness and baseness, 27, &c.; with a desire to rob him of his title to Phalaris, 42, &c.; with the use of ill language, &c. 46, &c.; with want of learning, &c. 50; with pedantry, 52, &c.; with want of method in his Dissertation, 75; with out-of-the-way quotations, 84; with want of modesty, 97; with plagiarism, 189, 263, 424; with Anglicisms in his Latin, 361; with affectation, 362; his captious objection to the use of the plural for the singular, 24, &c. 45, &c.; his banter and grimace, 24, &c. 181, 266, 267, 427; ii. 28, 37, 38; his Phalarism, 25; instance of his capacity as a critic, 37; his tutor and director of his studies, 42, &c.; cavils at the phrase, *first inventor*, 60, 274; at the phrase, *mien of a face*, 62; his unmeaning censure and abuse, 64, 178, 230, 240: his Examination, its heterogeneous character, 46, 70; his sneers and insults, 49, 176, 325; ii. 28; his barbarisms, 55, 186, 334; his mistakes, 58, 60, 62, 64, 79, 80, 93, 157, 158, 160, 163, 165, 169, 180—183, 185, 189, 190—194, 240, 244, 245, 248, 249, 256, 257, 260, 269, 270, 275, 279, 301, 302, 304, 307, 326, 327, 333, 335, 336, 340, 342, 343, 357, 364, 366, 368, 369, 372, 373, 375, 376, 418, 420, 421, 426; ii. 8, 11, 14, 20—22, 26, 35, 36, 38, 40, 49, 74—76, 89, 90, 93. 96—100, 103, 108, 109, 111; his inconsistencies and self-contradictions, 77, 81, 82, 157, 159, 160, 163, 167, 168, 224, 240, 261, 273, 426; ii. 35, 76, 77, 88, 93, 109; his good-breeding, 85; fetches a witness against himself, 92; misrepresents his opponent's words or arguments, 99, 166—169, 181, 218, 227, 243, 272, 366, 367; ii. 84, 87, 97, 98; his false reasoning, 100, 158, 159, 160, 185, 218, 219, 220—222, 228, 229, 235—237, 273, 274, 297—303, 318, 324, 341, 342, 367, 369, 370, 424, 426, 428; ii. 10, 18, 30, 41, 86, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 102, 107, 108; his emendation of Ὑβλαῖοι for Ὑαλαῖοι; why never made before, 156; his false emendations, 173; ii. 74; considers chronological arguments as touching only the particular Epistles, 187; his ignorance of anapæstic verse, 191—197; of Latin iambics, 196; his gross and scandalous blunders, 196, 197, 223, 224, 374, 376; ii. 15, 43, 49; absurdly thinks that Phalaris might use the phrase and thoughts of Herodotus, &c. 227; his nice distinction between *speech* and *message*, *ibid.*; his notion of what constitutes a poetical expression, 267, 268; misconceives the stress of his opponent's argument, 269, 280; commends a piece of gross and mean flattery, 273; his declamation against Thespis being the inventor of tragedy, all scraped together at second-hand from the commonest authors, 281; his judgment commonly in favour of the weaker side, 286; brings a charge of negligence by an argument that betrays it in himself, 301, 302; misrepresents his author, 319, 327; ii. 85; his false proposition, that things are always older than the names by which they are called, 337; quotes two corrupt passages, to prove that τραγῳδία signifies comedy, 343, 349; claims his opponent's argument as his own, 363, 364; cannot see that his bustle about Phalaris's country

does not advance his argument, 371; his acuteness, 425; a fatality in his errors, 426; plumes himself upon having emended a passage that had escaped Casaubon, 427; when smart upon his opponent generally happens to lash himself, 429; his bad judgment in six of the instances he brings on the word διώκω, ii. 28; his trifling exceptions, when in want of argument, ii. 35; his want of sagacity in not detecting three false readings of Pollux, ii. 38; his disingenuousness in quoting the opinion of Gronovius, &c. ii. 40; his groundless suppositions on the value of the talent meant in Phalaris's Epistles, ii. 48; brings an argument against himself, ii. 51, 85; his morose criticism in not allowing that Himera was afterwards called Thermæ, ii. 87; his anger against his opponent stronger than his loyalty to his Sicilian prince, ii. 89; calls Phalaris a *prince*, and Augustus a *tyrant*, ii. 90; wonderfully nice in accounting for Lucian's silence about the friendship between Phalaris and Stesichorus, ii. 96; his odd-sightedness, ii. 100.
Βρέντιοι, or Βρέττιοι, 396.
Brothers, the two pious, story of, 238.
Brutus, when he delivered his country, 134, 137.
Brutus, answers to, a forgery, 80, 83.
Buchanan, his violation of anapæstic measures, 190, 203.
Bull: see ταῦρος.

C.

Cadmus the Coan, 217.
Cælius Rhod., his distrust of the Epistles, 90.
Calf: see μόσχος.
Callias, when archon, 323.
Callimachus quoted, 266, 267; corrected and explained, 35, 37, 38.
Camarina, why called both maritime and inland, 157.
Cambyses, when in Egypt, 128, 135.
Cappellus, Jacobus, deceived by the spurious Phalaris, 89.
Carcinus, a tragic poet, 285; why called ὀρχηστικὸς, 312; his three sons, why called ὀρχησταί, 285.
Caro, Annibal, verses of, quoted, 67.
Carthalo, the Carthaginian admiral, his victory over the Romans, 159.
Carts used in processions at the festivals of different deities, 335; comic and tragic poets carried about in, 258, 336.
Casaubon, Is., emendations of, rejected, 150, 172, 188, 351.
Castelvetro, Ludovico, character of, defended, 66—68.
Catana, whence colonised, 409; place of Stesichorus's death, ii. 78; story of its contest with Himera for his ashes, ii. 78, 79, 84—86.
Cedar, lopping fatal to the, 226, 231.
Centussis, not a coin, but a sum, ii. 76.
Ceos, language of, 373.
Chabrias, when archon, 265.
Chalcidians of Eubœa found Naxos, 239.
Chalcidic towns in Sicily and Italy, 404; the laws of Charondas made for them, *ibid.*
Χαλκοῦς, value of, ii. 49.
Chares, when archon, 252.
Charondas the lawgiver, age of, 402, 403, 409; no Thurian, 403; his laws, 384—386, 398—417; when and for whom made, 402, 404; not received by the Thurians, 405; to what form of government adapted, 406, 407; in what dialect written, 409—411; used to be sung παρ' οἶνον at Athens, 413, 414; written in verse, 414, 416; particular laws of, noted, 406, 407, 408, 409, 414, 415; copy of his laws supposititious, 398—417.
Χερονεὺς, false reading for Χαιρωνεὺς, ii. 116.
Chinese, the, inventors of gunpowder and printing, 61.
Χόροι γυναικήϊοι κέρτομοι, 339.
Chorus, comic, 347, 348; cyclian, 341, 347, 348; the same as the dithyramb, 346; had its prize and judges at the Dionysia, 347; tragic, 332, 333, 339, 344, 347, 348; triple, what meant thereby, 348; comic, cyclian, tragic, of musicians, expenses of each, 399, 400; choruses, three of Bacchus, what meant thereby, 283, 349.
Chrysippus the Stoic, a racer in his youth, 121.
Χς for Χριστὸς, ii. 20.
Χθόπτης, 291.
Cicero, M. T., quoted, 167, 168, 271, 365; corrected, 176; undecided respecting Zaleucus, 378, 384.
Cimon fetches the bones of Theseus to Athens, 328—331.

Cinesias the dithyrambic poet, 344.
Cleanthes the Stoic, a boxer in his youth, 121.
Clearista, wife of Nicocles, ii. 80, 81.
Clemens Alexandrinus quoted, 172, 186, 291; ii. 125; explained, 122, 123, 124; deceived by a tragedy falsely ascribed to Thespis, 295.
Clisthenes the Athenian, age of, 152; not the Clisthenes mentioned in the Epistles of Phalaris, 152, 153.
Co, when used for *con* in Latin, 55.
Codicilli, ii. 127.
Coin, its greatest weight, ii. 75.
Columella quoted, 390.
Comedy, age of, 249—266; by whom and where invented, 249—251, 284; at first extemporal, 250, 288; nothing of the kind written before the time of Epicharmus, 251; its first measures, 249, 250, 255; its first prize, 260, 301, 353, 354; in what it had its origin, 260; more recent than tragedy, 251, 252; Greek writers of, do not always observe the rules of chronology, 183; instances of this, 183; the old, number of plays in, 248; its resemblance to the Roman satira, 334; the middle, number of plays in, 248.
Comias, when archon, 320.
Comic chorus. See Chorus.
Comic poets carried their plays about in carts, 336.
Cotemporary for contemporary, a barbarism, 55.
Crates, the philosopher, verses of, quoted, ii. 124.
Cratinus, a comic poet, a false reading for Carcinus, 284.
Crete, why called Ἑκατόμπολις, 367; language of, 359, 371.
Critics, ancient, province of, 82.
Crœsus, when began to reign, 129, 320; story of, 225; his conversation with Solon, 320, 322; his friendship with Æsop and Solon, ii. 82; his overthrow by Cyrus, 116, 296, 303; contemporary with Phalaris, ii. 121.
Crotonians, when conquered by Dionysius the Elder, 149.
Cujacius, the Latin version of Phalaris ascribed to him, a forgery, ii. 15.
Cyaxares, age of, 101.
Cyclian chorus. See Chorus.
Cylon, his conspiracy against the Pythagoreans, date of, 114, 137, 138, 144; murder of, when expiated, 125.
Cypress, lopping fatal to the, 226, 231.
Cypselus, age of, 102.
Cyrus, commencement of his reign, 102; his victory over Crœsus, 296, 303.

D.

Δαίμων ἕτερος, 266—270; the phrase explained, 266; when and by whom first used, 266, 267; a poetical quaintness in it, 266, 268; what this depends upon, 268.
Δαρετίου, corrupt reading for Δαμαρετίου, ii. 59.
Darius, age of, 296.
Daughter, license in the use of the word, ii. 19.
Decius Jubellius, 160.
Decussis, not a coin, but a sum, ii. 76; its amount, *ibid.*
Δεδοίκω, δεδίκω, formation of, 397.
Δεκάλιτρον, its value, ii. 42, 53, 63, 68, 69, 74; its metal, ii. 53.
Δεκᾶς, a name of measure and quantity, not a species of money, ii. 73.
Delphi, temple of, plundered by the Phocæans, ii. 121.
Delphos, a mistake for Delphi, 58.
Δελτὸς, ii. 127.
Demareta, wife of Gelon, piece of money coined by her, ii. 47, 57.
Δημαρέτιον νόμισμα, ii. 57, 58.
Demetrius the Magnesian, 430.
Democedes the Crotonian physician, ii. 123, 124.
Democritus, the first who used the phrase λόγος ἔργου σκιὰ, 242; age of, 243.
Δημόλογος, false reading for Δεινόλοχος, ii. 60, 61.
Demosthenes quoted, 399, 408; ii. 119; age of, 382; date of his oration De Corona, ii. 118.
Denarius, Roman, its value, ii. 49, 53, 56, 68, 69; its metal, ii. 53; etymology of the word, ii. 56.
Deunx, etymology of, ii. 66.
Dextans, etymology of, ii. 66.
Διδασκαλίαι, 248, 255.
Δίκη, an action at law, joined with the name of things, not of persons, 408.
Dinolochus, a Sicilian comic poet, ii. 60, 61; his Medea quoted, ii. 60.
Diocles, when archon, 261, 400.
Diodorus of Agyrium, why he abandoned the Doric dialect, 360.
Diodorus the Aspendian, age of, 149.
Diodorus Siculus quoted, 167, 222,

223, 380, 383, 385, 389, 403, 407, 409, 410, 414, 415, 421; ii. 104; corrected, 329, 415, 416; his account of Phintia defended, 160—162; of Taurominium, 235—242; imposed upon by a forgery of Zaleucus's laws, 383, 386; his copy of Charondas's laws a forgery, 398—417; his language, ii. 45, 51; his age, ii. 105; why he reckoned by Attic money, ii. 51; the Epistles unknown in his time, ii. 105.
Diogenes Laërtius quoted, 121, 241, 242, 243, 271, 329, 391, 418, 419, 430; explained, 136, 137; corrected, 121, 133.
Διώκω, 70; import of, ii. 25—31.
Diomedes the grammarian quoted, 340.
Diomedes Scholasticus, his opinion of a passage of Susarion controverted, 255.
Dion of Syracuse acquainted with Plato and Speusippus, 429.
Dion, surnamed Chrysostom, defended, 80.
Dionysia Trina, 283, 349; when celebrated, 283.
Dionysius Halicarnassensis quoted, ii. 46; corrected and explained, ii. 118; his dialect, 429; a reading in, defended, 126, 127.
Dionysius Metathemenos forged a tragedy in the name of Sophocles, 86.
Dionysius of Syracuse, age of, 95; the first Sicilian tyrant that styled himself βασιλεὺς on his money, 161; allegorical message of, to the Locrians, 230; his destruction of Naxos, 240; entertained Plato and others at his court, 429; ii. 90, 91; author of several tragedies, ii. 90, 91.
Dionysius Thrax, story of, 175.
Dioscorides the epigrammatist quoted, 260, 338, 353, 354; corrected, 281, 282, 283; explained, 348, 349.
Diphilus the comedian, his violation of chronology, 183; a comedy of, quoted, ii. 61.
Δὶς καὶ τρὶς, import of, 197.
Dithyramb, what meant thereby, 293, 340, 341; its inventor unknown, 341; prize of, 347—349; why called βοηλατὴς, 348; chorus belonging to, not tragic, but cyclian, 341.
Dithyrambic verse, example of, 341.
Διξὸς for δισσὸς, whose idiom, ii. 72.
Dodrans, etymology of, ii. 66.
Dodwell, Mr., noted, 100; imposed upon by the spurious Epistles, 69, 101, 152; mistake of, 137; his opinion concerning the age of Phalaris examined, 106—154, 382.
Dolon the inventor of comedy, a mistake, 259.
Doric dialect, the language generally of Sicily, 356; character of, 360; not suited for history or heroic poetry, 360; why exchanged by certain Dorians for another dialect, 360, 371—430; never changes ων into αν in genitives plural of the third declension, 36; from a preterperfect tense of verbs forms another present, 397; frequently shortens ας of the accusative plural, ii. 62.
Drachm, a sort of money not in use among the Dorian Greeks of Sicily and Italy, 389; Attic, or λεπτὴ, weight of, 387; its weight diminished by Solon, ii. 56; Æginean, weight of, 387; the latter why and by whom called παχεῖα, *ibid.*; Alexandrian, value of, ii. 44; no coin of that name in the old Sicilian money, ii. 34, 39, 47; whether ever coined there, ii. 41, 42.
Draco the lawgiver, age of, 380, 393; his laws written, 380, 414; the language thereof, 428.
Δρασκάζειν, afterwards ἀποδιδράσκειν, import of, ii. 5.

E.

Ecclesiastical writers, by what induced to give a late date to Pythagoras, 133.
Ἐχεπευκὲς, etymology of, 231.
Εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἀφικέσθαι, meaning of the phrase, ii. 92.
Ἐκλακτίζων, ἐκλακτισμὸς, ἐκλακτίσματα, 315.
Ἐκτρίψειν, 229.
Ἐλεγεῖον, different from μέλος, ii. 81, 92—95; how used in the sense of epitaph, ii. 93, 94.
Ἐμ for ἐν, ii. 63.
Empedocles of Agrigentum, an epic poet, 418; quoted, 133, 419, 420; corrected, 133; his Φυσικὰ, 419; his Καθαρμοὶ, probable subject of, 420; why he adopted the Ionic dialect, 360; why expelled from the Pythagoreans, 426.
Ἐμφυσιοῦται, from φύσις, a barbarism, 417.

Ἐν Ἀθήναις, Ἀθήνῃσι, ἐν Ἀθήνῃσι, 256, 413.
English language, changes in, ii. 2, 3; chiefly in the spelling, ii. 7; principal cause of its changes, ii. 13.
Enna, 154.
Ἐντέχνως, 121.
Hos for ἑως, what idiom, ii. 8.
Epaminondas, age of, 143.
Ἐπέσθων explained, 38.
Ἔπη, ἐποποιΐα, and ποίημα ἐπικὸν, of the same import, 418.
Ephebi, at what year so called, 119.
Ἐφησήϊα, 121.
Epic poem, 418—420.
Epic poets, authors belonging to that class, 418; not admitted into the Pythagorean sect, 426.
Ἐπιχαιρεκακία, 48.
Epicharmus, inventor of comedy, 251—253; age of, 213, 252, 292; long life of, 252; added certain letters to the alphabet, 292; ii. 7; his language, 355; many pieces forged in his name, 86; not the Epicharmus of the Epistles, 154; fragments of, quoted, corrected, and explained, ii. 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71.
Epicurus, age of, 122.
Epigenes the Sicyonian, the pretended inventor of tragedy, 275, 281, 286.
Epigenes cited by Athenæus, not the Sicyonian, but the Athenian comic poet, 286; quoted and corrected, 287, 288.
Ἐπικοπὴ, lopping, what meant thereby, 231.
Ἐπικτήτου σκέλος explained, 95.
Epimenides the Cretan quoted, 88, 373; corrected, 373; his poems written in Ionic, not Cretic, 373; why, 429; his letters to Solon forgeries, 430; ii. 9; expiates the murder of Cylon at Athens, 125; one of the preceptors of Pythagoras, 124, 125; age of, 125.
Ἐπιορκεῖν, afterwards ὀμόσαι, import of, ii. 5.
Ἐπίσκεψις, false reading for ἐπίσκηψις, 408.
Ἐπίσκηψις, the law so called, 408; when enacted, 409.
Erasmus, his opinion of the Epistles of Phalaris, of Seneca, &c., 80.
Erythia, wife of Phalaris, inconsistent accounts of, in the Epistles, ii. 79, 80, 87, 88.
Eryxidas, or Eryxias, of Chalcis, when victor at Olympia, 134.
Eteonicus, 246.
Ἠθοποιΐαι, 83.
Etymologicon Magnum quoted, 170, 340; explained, 351, 352; refuted, 353, 354.
Eualcidas, 109.
Evagoras, a Zanclean, 220.
Eubulus quoted, 170; explained, 179; age of, 179.
Euclides, when archon, ii. 7.
Eudoxus the Cnidian, a lawgiver, his poverty, ii. 91.
Euphorion quoted, 174.
Eupolis the comedian, fabulous story of, 377.
Euripides, age of, 248, 399; quoted, 194, 247, 262; corrected, 200, 201; four plays of, acted in one year, 264; his Philoctetes, when acted, 248, 264; his Phœnissæ, when acted, 265; noted for the lowness of his style and characters, 343, 399; his Cyclops, a play of the satyrical kind, 334; a cenotaph erected by the Athenians to his memory, ii. 85.
Eurymenes, a scholar of Pythagoras in boxing, 121.
Eusebius quoted, 98, 340; his histories not to be depended on, 319.
Euseboneora, a mistake for Eusebon Cora, 238.
Εὐσεβῶν Χώρα, 238.
Eustathius, age of, 93; quoted, 172, 231; appears to have used the Epitome only of Athenæus, 172, 175, 188—190.
Euthymus, when victor at Olympia, 221.
Ἐξαμάξειν, a barbarism, 334.
Ἐξ ἁμάξης με ὕβρισε, origin of this proverb, 335.
Ἐξέφηβος, 118.

F.

Father, license in the use of the word, ii. 19.
Fazellus, Thomas, deceived by the spurious Phalaris, 89.
Festus corrected and explained, ii. 66; his authority defended, ii. 40, 41.
Fœminilis, barbarous word coined by Queen Elizabeth, 272.
Fortunatianus quoted, 277, 278, 279.
Fuit, import of, 123.

G.

Γαλάτη, false reading for Γαλάτεια, ii. 61.
Galen quoted, 85, 392.

Gela, why called both maritime and inland, 157; by whom and when destroyed, 160, 162.
Gellius, Aulus, quoted, 226; corrected and explained, ii. 117.
Gelo the Syracusan, 161; acquires the government of Syracuse and Gela, 212; age of, 212, 217; date of his victory over the Carthaginians, ii. 57; his donary to Apollo at Delphi, ii. 58, 123.
Geloans, not different from the Phintians, 162.
Generation, a, how many years it consisted of, 103, 104, 127, 145.
Γενέσθαι, γένεσις, import of, 123, 124.
Γεφυρίζειν, import of, 335.
Glaucippus, when archon, 400.
Goat: see Τράγος.
Gold, scarce in Greece in the time of Phalaris, ii. 121, 122.
Golden verses, not Pythagoras's, 426; quoted, 379.
Grævius, J. G., his dedication of Rubenius, 30; his letters to, and character of, Dr. Bentley, 28, 32—34, 51; his mistake in ascribing to him a correction of Callimachus, 35.
Greek language, changes of, in the different ages, ii. 2—13; instances of such changes, ii. 2, 5, 6; cause of its corruption, ii. 12; later writers of, imitated the old ones, ii. 12.
Gregory of Nazianzen quoted and explained, 95, 96.
Grotius, his violation of anapæstic measures, 190, 203; his mistake of a passage in Diodorus, 415.
Γυμνικοί, 315.
Gyraldus, Lilius, his testimony of L. Castelvetro, 66; mistaken regarding Epigenes, 286—288; his distrust of the Epistles, 90.

H.

Αλα, ἁλίην, ἁλὸς, double meaning of, 37, 38.
Hamilcar the Carthaginian general routed by Gelo, 212.
Ἅπαξ καὶ δὶς, import of, 197.
Harduin, Monsieur, his work on coins noted, 375.
Ἁρμονία τοῦ κόσμου, a Pythagorical expression, ii. 115, 118.
Haud multum, 144, 145.
Ἄτερος for ἕτερος, what idiom, 270.
Hebrew language, the primitive language of mankind, ii. 11; its long duration unchanged, ii. *ibid.*; cause thereof, ii. 11, 12.
Hegestratus, when archon, 320.
Helianax, brother of Stesichorus, ii. 91.
Ἡλικία, import of, 122, 123.
Ἡλικίαι, 137.
Hellanicus the historian, age of, ii. 126.
Ἡμι, form of compounds with, ii. 63.
Ἡμιλίτριον, its value, ii. 59, 71; its metal, ii. 53.
Hephæstion quoted, 102; ii. 59.
Ἑπταδράχμως, Doric for ἑπταδράχμους, ii. 45.
Heraclean, or Herculean bowl, why so called, 176, 177.
Heraclides of Pontus put forth tragedies in the name of Thespis, 86, 289; himself deceived by a similar forgery, 86; no remains of Thespis's heard of before his time, 289; quoted, 407; his age, ii. 102.
Heraclitus, epigram on, 177.
Ἡραΐνη, a mistake for Ἡρωΐνη, 288.
Ἡράκλειος, how formed, 172.
Herculean cup, one single cup so called, 173, 174; the same with the Sun's cup, 174, 175.
Hercules, story respecting, 173, 174.
Hercules Œtæus, not a play of Seneca's, 197, 203.
Hermesianax the Colophonian poet quoted, 132, 269.
Hermippus, his story of Pythagoras, 130; quoted, 413.
Hermodamas, a preceptor of Pythagoras, 125.
Hermogenes quoted, 430.
Herodotus quoted, 61, 225, 270; ii. 86, 92, 93, 94; explained, 339; age of, 223; an example of his use of prolepsis, 339; not understood by the vulgar in the time of Oppian, ii. 13.
Hesiod, the Orchomenians advised by the oracle to fetch his bones, ii. 85.
Hesychius quoted, 35, 170, 315, 353, 386; ii. 60, 67, 69, 70; corrected, 315, 387; ii. 67; mistaken, ii. 69, 70.
Ἑταιριστρίαι, ii. 23.
Ἑξάλιτρα, ἐξ τάλαντα, false readings for ἑξᾶντα, ii. 38, 67, 74.
Ἑξάμηνος, ἑξαήμερος, ἑξαέτης, &c. meaning of, ii. 74.
Ἑξάντιον, false reading for ἑξάντων, ii. 67.
Ἑξᾶς, ii. 66, 67; whose money, ii. 50;

its value, ii. 53, 70, 71, 73; its metal, ii. 53.
Hicetas tyrant of Syracuse, 160.
Hiero tyrant of Agrigentum, 161, 212, 213; his patronage of learning, 141; his age, 100, 213, 217; ii. 122, 123; not the Hiero mentioned in the Epistles, 154; his donary to Apollo at Delphi, ii. 122, 123.
Hierom, St., quoted, 98.
Himera, 164, 165, 168; a maritime town, 165; its language, 356; afterwards called Thermæ, ii. 79, 87; the birth-place of Stesichorus, ii. 78; story of its contest with Catana for his ashes, ii. 78, 79, 84—86.
Hippias, eldest son of Pisistratus, age of, 317, 318.
Hippocrates, tyrant of Gela, age of, 212; besieges the Zanclæans, 217.
Hippostratus, 104, 105, 113.
Historians, the early, make every body's speeches for them, 226, 227; sometimes disagree in putting different speeches into the mouth of the same person, 229.
Οἱ περὶ Πλάτωνα, οἱ περὶ Ἀριστοτέλη, what meant by these phrases, 24.
Homer quoted, 175, 177, 193, 358; ii. 7, 8, 14, 19, 28, 127; the poems Cypria and Œchalia Capta said to be forgeries, 86; not understood by the vulgar in the time of Oppian, ii. 13; his death, ii. 92; temples to his memory, date thereof, ii. 85, 86; Scholiast on, quoted, 392.
Ὁμόλια, false reading for ἡμιωβόλια, ii. 35.
Horace quoted, 17, 48, 66, 131, 252, 258, 284, 336, 338, 401, 414; ii. 27.
Ὡς ἐξ ἀμάξης λαλεῖ, origin of this proverb, 336.
Hospitalius, Michael, his forged poem De Lite, 91.
Ὑαλαῖοι, false reading for Ὑβλαῖοι, 155, 156.
Hybla, a town in Sicily, 154, 156; not mediterranean, but maritime, 158.
Hyblenses, 154.
Ὑβλη, 375.
[illegible] the Rhodian, his victory at [illegible] 119.
[illegible], 356.
[illegible] in tragedy and [illegible] after their inven[illegible] for business and
Iamblichus censured, 114, 115, 134, 135, 148, 149; ii. 97, 98, 109; corrected, 147—151; a Platonic, not a Pythagorean, 426.
James, St., book of Revelation ascribed to him, a forgery, ii. 114.
Ιας and ανδρος, Greek names in, equivalent to one another, 216; examples thereof, *ibid.*
יגר שהדותא Igar Sahdutha, ii. 11.
Ignatius quoted, ii. 29.
Ἴλεια, a mistake for Ἰλίεια, the Ilian games, 121.
Ιν, accusative of words in, sometimes long, 193, 194.
Inghiramius, his forgery, 84; ii. 113, 114.
Ιο mistaken by copiers for ω, ii. 67.
Ionians, anciently one and the same people with the Attics, 358; ii. 7; when and by whom carried into Asia, 361.
Ionic dialect, once the fashionable language of epic poetry, 429; character of, 430; adopted by several Dorian authors, 360, 371—430; originally the same with the Attic, 358; ii. 7; gradual changes in, ii. 7; had four idioms, *ibid.*
Isæus the orator corrected, 400, 401, 408.
Ἴσαις, Doric and Æolic accusative for ἴσας, 395.
Ἰσομιλήσιον, 389, 390.
Ἰσοταραντῖνον, 391.
Iterum atque tertium, import of, 197.
Juvenal quoted, 67.
Justinian quoted, ii. 119, 120.

K.

Κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπογράφην τῶν ἡλικιῶν explained, 136, 137.
Κατὰ τὸν Δημόκριτον, κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον, &c., import of, 244, 245.
Καταμαρτύριον, false reading for ψευδομαρτυριῶν, 408.
Καθιμᾶσε, falsely accented for καθίμασε, 36.
Καθίμασε, import and quantity of, 36.
Κενοτάφιον, ii. 85.
Κεπφαττελεβώδης, 151.
King, Dr., his account of a conversation between Dr. Bentley and Mr. Bennet examined, and its inconsistencies exposed, 17—22.
Κιθαρῳδοί, harpers, contended for a calf, 348.
Κλειος, adjectives in, formed from names in κλης, 172, 181.

Κναξζβι, 291.
Κοινὴ διάλεκτος, a language of the learned, ii. 13.
Κόνιν, last syllable of, sometimes long, 193.
Κόσμος, the world first called so by Pythagoras, 391, 392; ii. 115—118; reason thereof, 392.
Κῶμοι, κωμῆται, 353, 354.
Κωμῳδία, of the same import as τραγῳδία, 342, 349, 350, 353; at first the common name of both comedy and tragedy, 353, 354; etymology of, 353.
Κρατῖνος, false reading for Καρκίνος, 285.
Κρόνους τὸν νοῦν, false reading, 313.
Ks for κύριος, ii. 20.
Κυκλικῶν, false reading for κυκλίων, 345, 346; its first syllable often short, 345.
Κύκλιοι χόροι, 346.
Κύων, its import in a passage of Athenæus, 64.
Κύρβεις of Solon, ii. 7.

L.

Λακείνιον, temple of Juno Lucina, where situated, 396.
Lactantius De Mortibus Persecutorum, ii. 103.
Lampsaceni, threatening message of Crœsus to, 225.
Languages, living, their perpetual change, ii. 1, 2.
Lasus Hermionensis, pretended inventor of the dithyramb, age of, 341.
Lawgivers anciently of the middle rank of citizens, ii. 91.
Laws sung before the knowledge of letters, 413, 414.
Λέγεται, import of, 180, 181.
Leontines, 163.
Leontiscus, victor at the Olympic games, 220; age of, 221.
Λεπτὰ καὶ παχεῖαι δραχμαί, 386—389.
Lesbos, language of, 374; the metropolis of the Æolian cities, *ibid.*
Λέσβος, in a passage in Ælian and Suidas a mistake for Λέβεδος, 374.
Letters of the alphabet: see Alphabet.
Λέων and his ass, 47, 52.
Λέων false reading in Hesychius for Λύκος, 387.
Λεωνίνα, 283, 349.
Libella, its metal and value, ii. 53, 56, 60, 68, 69; its metal, ii. 53, 56.
Livy quoted, ii. 46, 47.
Locrians of Italy, laws of, 376—398; origin of these, 379; the first laws that were written, 380; a remarkable law of, 381; only one new law made by them in cc. years, 381; what this was, 384; their good government, 384, 385; species of money in use among them, 389; had neither the δραχμὴ nor ὀβολὸς, 389; their language, 394—398; their songs called μοιχικοὶ, 398.
Λόγος εἴδωλον τῶν ἔργων, whose saying, 245.
Λόγος ἔργου σκιὰ, 242—246; explained, 242; when and by whom first used, 242—246.
Λόγος ἑρμοῦ αἰκίη, a mistake, 244.
Logotheta, Symeon Metaphrastus, age of, 94.
Λοκρικὸν ἆσμα, a Locrian song, an example of, corrected and explained, 397, 398.
Lucian, the Epistles of Phalaris ascribed by some to him, 90; quoted, 170; his story of an embassy from Phalaris to Delphi, ii. 107—109; his Dialogues of the Dead, ii. 107; the Epistles unknown to, or suspected by him, ii. 101, 107, 108.
Lucian's ass, 53.
Lucretius quoted, 61, 267.
Lycon of Troas, a peripatetic, a wrestler in the Ilian games, 121.
Lycurgus quoted, ii. 94.
Lygdamis, tyrant of Naxos, 128.
Lynceus Samius quoted and explained, 185.
Lysias the orator, age of, 409; ii. 4; quoted, ii. 4, 5, 6; corrected, ii. 5; the best pattern of the Attic tongue fashionable in his time, ii. 8; his oration against Theomnestus, when made, ii. 4, 5.
Lysinus, a tragic poet of the name never heard of, 274, 275.
Lysis, two Pythagoreans of this name, 144; the scholar to Pythagoras not the preceptor to Epaminondas, 142—144.

M.

Macrobius corrected and explained, 174.
Mæno, 160.
Μακαρίτης, import of, 94.

Malalas Johannes corrected, 323.
Mamertines of Messana, 160, 162.
Manilius the Roman poet, character of, 81.
Mantinea, battle of, when fought, 142.
Marathon, battle of, when fought, 125, 317.
Marmora Oxon.: see Arundel Marble.
Maronites of Mount Libanus, their language, ii. 12.
Μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνειν, θεοῦ, origin of this saying, ii. 119, 120.
Μηδικὰ Φαίδωνος, probably a mistake for Μηδικὰ Ἀφεψίωνος, 328.
Μελέται of the sophists, 355.
Μέλητος, Μέλιτος, 345.
Meletus the tragic poet, 344, 345.
Melessus the philosopher, acquainted with Themistocles, 323.
Μέλος and μελῳδία, signification of, ii. 81; μέλος different from ἐλεγεῖον, ii. 92—95.
Menagius, his character of L. Castelvetro, 66; distrusts the Epistles, 90.
Menenius Agrippa, his poverty, ii. 92.
Μήποτε, import of, 182.
Messana, Messenians: see Zancle, Zanclæans.
Μετάφρασις, 94.
Metasthenes, a forgery, 88.
Metelli, the, quoted, 277.
Meursius mistakes Scaliger's Ὀλυμπιάδων Ἀναγραφὴ for an ancient piece, 215, 329; his false corrections in consequence, 329, 330.
Micythus, 216.
Mien of a face, the phrase defended, 62, 63.
Milesian cloths, 389, 390.
Milesians and Samians take Zancle, 205; are driven out by Anaxilas, 205, 211, 218.
Mileton, Miletum, mistakes for Miletus, 59.
Μιλήτου ἅλωσις, the taking of Miletus, title of a tragedy of Phrynichus, for which he was fined 1000 drachms, 304, 308, 314.
Miletus, when sacked by the Persians, 210.
Miltiades, when archon, 205; threat of Crœsus respecting, 225—232.
Mina, Attic, value of, 400; ii. 34, 44; [illegible] ii. 38, 39; no such name [illegible] the Doric colo- [illegible] introduced [illegible] 326; not the interlocutor in Plato's dialogue of that name, 326, 327.
Μισοτύραννος, 355.
Μνάμαρχος, 133.
Mnasalcas, an epigram of, quoted, ii. 95.
Μνῶν, false reading in Suidas for νούμμων, ii. 54.
Money, scarce at Athens in the time of the tragedians, 399; public, not the custom in Phalaris's time for princes to set their images thereon, 161; by whom first coined at Rome, ii. 73; why authors in Attic, or the common dialect, reduce the sums of money of any country to the Attic account, ii. 46, 47; ancient historians expressed themselves in round sums, not aiming at perfect accuracy, ii. 68.
Μοιχοί, μοιχεύτριαι, ii. 23.
Μόσχος, a calf, the prize of harping, 348, 349.
Moschus the poet, dialect in which he wrote, 355; quoted, ii. 95.
Mother, license in the use of the word, ii. 19.
Mucianus, Licinius, imposed upon by a sham letter of Sarpedon's, ii. 128, 129.
Mumpsimus, absurd blunder for sumpsimus, 58, 59.
Muretus, his forged iambics, 91.
Μύθοι καὶ πάθη, by whom first brought on the stage, 321.
Μυριάμφορος, meaning of, ii. 75.

N.

N before M, B, Π, or Φ, changed into M in ancient writing, ii. 63; in modern Greek pronounced like M in those cases, *ibid.*
Nævius, the first Latin poet who used Saturnian verse, 277; corrected, *ibid.*
Naogeorgus, his Latin version of Phalaris, ii. 15, 16.
Naxians, the inhabitants of Naxos, afterwards called Tauromenites, 232—239.
Naxos, 232—242; by whom founded, 239; when and by whom destroyed, 239, 240.
Neapolitan talent, ii. 54.
Nearchus, tyrant of Velia, age of, 241.
Negoce, the word defended, 54.
Νεοσμίλευτα γράμματα, 282.
Nestorean cup, a particular cup described by Homer, 175; no sort of cups so called, *ibid.*

Νεστορὶς, a word only of grammarians, 175.
Νευρίδας ἔχειν, a corrupt reading, 295.
Nicander, an epic poet, 418.
Nicocles the Syracusian, his application for a poem from Stesichorus an improbable story, ii. 80, 81, 89.
Νοήσιμα ετα and νονήσμια ευτα, false readings in an epigram of Dioscorides, 281, 282.
Nominative without a verb, or instead of an oblique case, Attic solecisms, 363.
Νομῳδὸς, a law-singer, 414, 416.
Nonnus the poet, character of, 95.
Nonnus the commentator on Greg. Naz. not Nonnus the poet, 95; his mistakes, 95, 96; the same commentary attributed to one Maximus, 96.
Nonuncium, not a legitimate word, ii. 66.
Nossis the poetess, a Locrian, 394-396; epigrams of, corrected and explained, 395—397; her dialect, *ibid.*; her age, 396; her mother, daughter, 396, 397.
Νόστοι of Stesichorus, 165.
Νοῦμμος, 389; ii. 64, 65; whose money, ii. 50; a word of Greek origin, ii. 64; its derivation, ii. 50; its value, ii. 35, 53, 64, 68, 69; its metal, ii. 36, 53, 75; Tarentine, its impress, ii. 64, 75.
Numa, age of, 127; some writings of his said to have lain in a stone coffin for 490 years, ii. 112, 113; various accounts as to their number, ii. 113; the story examined and refuted, *ibid.*
Nummus, Roman, value of, ii. 53, 69; why called sestertius, *ibid.*; of what metal, ii. 53, 76; when first coined, *ibid.*

O.

Ὀβολὸς, not in use among the Dorian Greeks of Sicily and Italy, 389; Attic, value of, 387; ii. 68; Æginean, value of, 387; ii. 68; Attic and Æginean, their proportion to each other, ii. 68.
Ocellus Lucanus, 151; his De Natura Universi, in what dialect originally written, 423—427.
Octans, ii. 70, 72, 73; not used of money, ii. 73.
Octavia, not a play of Seneca's, 203.
Octussis, not a coin, but a sum, ii. 76.
Οἰκῆος for θεράποντος, ii. 6; a doubly Ionic form, ii. 7.
Ὄλεθρον εὗρε, 267—270.
Olympiodorus quoted, 143, 393.
Ων never changed into αν in the genitive plural of the third declension by the Dorians, 36.
One as good as a multitude, the phrase defended and illustrated, 177, 178.
Oppian, his use of antiquated words, ii. 13; not understood by the vulgar in his own town, *ibid.*
Ὀρχηστικοὶ, some poets why so called, 284, 312.
Ὀρχηστικωτέρα, the first poetry of the stage so characterised, 312.
Orchomenians, advised by the oracle to fetch the bones of Hesiod, ii. 85.
Ὀρφανία, import of, ii. 102, 109.
Orpheus, poems said to have been forged by Pythagoras in his name, 86; an epic poet, 418.
Οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον, 286, 293.
Οὐγκία, 389, ii. 67—73; its derivation, ii. 50; whose money, ii. 50; its metal, ii. 53.
Ovid quoted, 234, 240; explained, and mistakes in the Oxford edition of, exposed, 44, 45; his love-letters, 83; instances of prolepsis from, 234; his authority defended, 241; Scholiast on, quoted, 240.
Our, the word, great license in the use of, 25, 46.

P.

Παχεῖα δραχμὴ, 386—389.
Pæon instead of dactyl, ii. 59.
Παῖδας, false reading in Pollux for πέδας, ii. 60.
Παίδων ἐρασταὶ, παιδεραστὰι, import of, ii. 2, 20—25.
Palm-tree, lopping fatal to the, 226, 231.
Palmerius, his emendation of the Arundel Marble rejected, 258, 259.
Pamphilus the Alexandrian quoted and explained, 171.
Παναθήναια, when celebrated, 283.
Παράβασις, the part of a play so called, 255; measures used therein, *ibid.*
Parmenides, an epic poet, 418.
Paterculus, Velleius, when and by whom first quoted, ii. 102.
Pausanias, his account of Anaxilas and Messana refuted, 205—224.
Pearson, Bishop, a mistake of, ii. 29, 30; his emendation of a saying of Hierocles corrected, ii. 117.

Πείρας δευτέρας λαβεῖν, not true Greek, 416.
Pelopidas, his application to Phalaris for a poem from Stesichorus, ii. 78, 89.
Πενταετία, what meant by it, 132.
Πεντηκοντάλιτρον, ii. 57—59; whose money, ii. 50; by whom coined, ii. 47, 57; its value, ii. 47, 53, 57, 68, 74; its metal, ii. 53.
Πεντούγκιον, 65, 66; called by the Latins quincunx, ii. 65; its value, ii. 53, 65, 71; its metal, ii. 53, 65.
Πεφασμένως, afterwards φανερῶς, import of, ii. 6.
Perfect tense of verbs, formation of a Doric present from, 397.
Periander of Corinth, age of, 102.
Perictyone, a Pythagorean, the fragments of her writings forgeries, 421, 422.
Perillus, inventor of the brazen bull, 266, 269; the first who suffered in it, ii. 39.
Περσικοῖς, false reading for Φυσικοῖς, 419.
Petavius mistaken, 330.
Petronius Arbiter, the Belgrade supplement to, a forgery, 84, 88.
Πεύκη, 231.
Πεύκης τρόπον κόπτειν, 226, 232.
Phædon, when archon, 328, 329.
Phædrus, when and by whom first mentioned, ii. 102.
Φαίωνος, corrupt reading for Ἀφεψίωνος, 329.
Phalaris tyrant of Agrigentum, age of, 97—154, 155, 171, 205, 225, 243, 248, 275, 296, 303; a Sicilian born, 357, 364—371; ii. 101; contemporary with Pythagoras, 98, 99, 233; with Solon, ii. 4, 31; with Servius Tullius, ii. 73; said to have been the first tyrant in the world, 102; when and by whom deposed, 103, 105, 114, 116; extent of his dominion, ii. 90; only a publican before he usurped the tyranny, ii. 91; his friendship with Stesichorus a fiction, ii. 82, 83, 96—100; so his conversation with Abaris, ii. 109; a tradition that he ate his own son, 106; his Bull, story of, examined, ii. 104; himself, his mother, and his friends burnt in it, 240—242, 365; ii. 102.
Phalaris, Epistles of, a forgery, [illegible]; high character of them [illegible] Temple, 77; the work of some sophist, 89; many deceived by them, *ibid.*; ancients by whom mentioned, 89, 92; moderns by whom espoused, 89, 90; moderns by whom distrusted, 90; ascribed by some to Lucian, *ibid.*; proofs of their spuriousness from their violation of chronology, 154—354; ii. 114—120; in speaking of Phintia, 154—164; of Alæsa, 164—169; of Thericlean cups, 169—204; of the Zanclæans and Messenians, 204—225; in using Herodotus's phrase, πίτυος δίκην ἐκτρίβειν, 225—232; in speaking of the Tauromenites, 232—242; in using Democritus's phrase, λόγος ἔργου σκιά, 242—246; Euripides's phrase, ἀδάνατον ὀργήν, &c. 246—266; and Pindar's and Callimachus's phrases, δαίμων ἕτερος, ὄλεθρον εὗρε, 266—270; in calling Pythagoras φιλόσοφος, 270—274; in speaking of tragedy, 274—354; in using the words πρόνοια, στοιχεῖα, in the Platonic sense, and the Pythagorical expression, ἁρμονία τοῦ κόσμου, ii. 115—118; in quoting the saying, μηδὲν ἁμαρτάνειν, θεοῦ, ii. 118—120; proofs of their spuriousness from their language, 355—ii. 78; in Phalaris writing Attic, 355—430; and that the new Attic, ii. 1—31; proofs of their spuriousness in reckoning money according to the Attic account, ii. 31—78; proofs of their spuriousness from the improbability, absurdity, inconsistency, &c. of their matter, ii. 78—100, 120—125; from their late appearance, being unknown to the ancients, ii. 100—114, 125—129.
Phalarism, 25.
Phavorinus quoted, ii. 115.
Pherecydes, preceptor to Pythagoras, 124; age of, 126.
Φιάλιον χρυσοῦν, ii. 122.
Philargyrius quoted, 340.
Philip of Macedon, age of, 144; his golden cup, ii. 122.
Φιλόσοφος, philosopher, 270—274; the word, when and by whom first used, 271.
Philostratus, his style, 362; solecisms of, 363.
Philoxenus, his Glossary quoted, 258.
Phintia, Phintis, 154—164; a town in Sicily, 154; when and by whom built, 155; not two towns of that

name, 157; why called both maritime and inland, 157—159; the residue of the Geloans transplanted thither, 162.
Phintians, 154—163; the same people with the Geloans, 162.
Phintias tyrant of Agrigentum, 155; age of, 160, 161; built the town Phintia, 155, 161, 162; for the residue of the Geloans, 162.
Φλεγμὼ, 291.
Phocæans plunder the temple of Delphi, ii. 121.
Φωνῇ χρῆσθαι τῇ πατρῴᾳ, what meant thereby in Jamblichus, 425.
Phormus, more correctly Phormis, the Syracusian, mentioned as one of the inventors of comedy, 251; an officer in the service of Gelo, 217, 253.
Photius suspects the Epistles, 92; author in, corrected, 422; quoted, ii. 60, 68.
Phraortes, time of his reign, 101.
Phrynichus the tragic poet, age of, 297, 304—306; scholar of Thespis, 285, 301; called ὀρχηστικὸς, 284, 312—317; celebrated for his songs, 311; one of the first to introduce the new and serious tragedy, 294, 321; the first that made women its subject, 291, 300; when he first wrote, 302, 321; the goat no longer the prize of tragedy in his epoch, 301; his victory, 305; fined for his Μιλήτου ἅλωσις, 304, 314; period between his first and last plays, 307; quoted, 305, 317; not two tragedians of this name, 307—317.
Phrynichus the Athenian general, 309, 310.
Phrynichus the comic poet, 308, 309.
Φυσιόω, its first syllable long, 417.
Physicians, how hired and remunerated in the age of Phalaris, ii. 123, 124.
Pindar, age of, 116; quoted, 61, 266, 348, 384; explained, ii. 98, 99; got his livelihood by the Muses, ii. 81; his character of Phalaris, ii. 82; the Epistles unknown to him, ii. 101; Scholiast on, quoted, 214; corrected, 215, 216.
Πίναξ πτυκτὸς, what meant thereby, ii. 127, 128.
Pine-tree, lopping fatal to, 225, 226, 231.
Πῖος, a Doric word, ii. 65.
Pisistratus tyrant of Athens, when he usurped the government, 103, 320; story of his wounding himself, 320, 321; his sons, when expelled, 332.
Pitch-tree, lopping fatal to, 226, 231.
Pittacus tyrant of Lesbos, age of, 102.
Πίτυος δίκην ἐκτρίβειν, whose saying, 225—232.
Plato quoted, 61, 95, 125, 285, 289, 385; ii. 22, 116; explained, 125, 326; saying of, 245; age of, 146, 149; a disciple of Archytas, 148, 149; a wrestler at the Isthmian games, 121; his statement respecting the age of tragedy given by him as a paradox, 285, 325; the Epistles unknown to him, ii. 101; his usage of the words πρόνοια, στοιχεῖον, ii. 115, 116.
Plato the comedian quoted, 280.
Plays, first subject of, 293; at first carried about the villages in carts, 258; of the old and middle comedy, number of, 248.
Πλῆκτρον, πλήσσω, 316.
Pliny quoted, 223, 231, 232; ii. 127, 128; corrected, ii. 128; mistaken in making Thericles a turner, 169.
Plural, use of, for the singular, a license familiar in languages, 24, 25, 45, 46.
Plutarch quoted, 124, 172, 182, 186, 242, 244, 259, 320, 336, 372, 392, 418; ii. 21, 22, 47; corrected, 216, 328; explained, 330; censured, 321, 322; imposed upon by Heraclides Ponticus, 294.
Ποδοκάκη, afterwards ξύλον, import of, ii. 5.
Πωλεῖσθαι, afterwards βαδίζειν, import of, ii. 6.
Politianus ascribes the Epistles to Lucian, 90.
Πολλὰ καινὰ τοῦ πολέμου, 232.
Pollux, Julius, quoted, 172, 186, 387; ii. 60, 61, 69; corrected, 295, 315; ii. 35, 37, 50, 60, 65, 67; imposed upon by Heraclides Ponticus, 295; explained and defended, ii. 35—40.
Polybius quoted, ii. 87, 104; age of, ii. 105; defends the story of Phalaris's Bull, ii. 104, 105; the Epistles unknown in his time, ii. 105.
Polyclitus, 169, ii. 32; story of his rich reward from Phalaris absurd, ii. 120—125.
Polycrates tyrant of Samos, age of, 128, 129; his father, 129.
Πομπεύειν and πομπεία, import of, 335.

Πορνεῖα, false reading for πρόνοια, ii. 117.
Πόρνος ἐν παισὶ, import of, ii. 21.
Porphyry quoted, 360, 422.
Ποτὶ, Doric for πρὸς, 397.
Ποτῴκω, formation of, 397.
Πρ for πατὴρ, ii. 20.
Pratinas, his plays, 294; why called ὀρχηστικὸς, 312.
Proclus quoted, 385; corrected and explained, ii. 116.
Προδεδωκότα, 57.
Προδίδωμι, 70; import of, ii. 25—31.
Prolepsis, use of, 234, 339.
Πρόνοια, Divine Providence, first used by Plato in this sense, ii. 115, 116.
Protagoras, a lawgiver to the Thurians, at first a porter, ii. 91.
Προτρέπω, import of, in New Attic, ii. 2, 14—17; in the sense of exhorting never takes a dative after it, ii. 14.
Proverbial *gnomæ* mostly borrowed from the stage, 247.
Proverbs, Greek and Latin, the use of them defended, 55, 56.
Psaumis, when victor at the Olympic games, 215.
Ψευδομαρτύρων, false reading for ψευδομαρτυριῶν, 408.
Πτήσσω, import of, 314.
Ptolemy quoted, ii. 87.
Pugillares, ii. 127.
Pyrrhichists, 400.
Pythagoras, age of, 98, 114—151; a native of Samos, 426; table exhibiting a view of his life, 117, 118; to whom scholar, 124; his ἡλικία or ἀκμὴ, 117, 122—124; this, why postdated by ecclesiastical writers, 133; when first in Italy, 117, 126—136, 382; in Sicily, 116; his victory at Olympia πυγμῇ, 117—119; the first that boxed ἐντέχνως, 121; why called κομήτης, 120; his stay in Egypt, 135, 136; his marriage with Theano, 132; his sons, 133; his death, 118, 136—151; contemporary with Phalaris, 99, 233; ii. 97; not with Numa, 127; not concerned in deposing Phalaris, 114; stories respecting him, 130, 233, 234; his advice to his scholars, 181; their devotion to him, 379; their number at Crotona, 138; had no society of scholars in Italy after Cylon's conspiracy, 117; his followers almost all destroyed then, *ibid.*; the first who called himself φιλόσοφος, 271; and the world κόσμος, 391; ii. 118; his division of a man's life, 124, 137; said to have forged poems in the name of Orpheus, 86; not the author of the Golden Verses, 426; epistle ascribed to him, a forgery, *ibid.*
Pythagoras Rheginus, a statuary, age of, 221.
Pythagorean sect, continuance of, and succession in, after Pythagoras's death, 145—151; excluded all epic poets, 426; its decay, to what attributed, 361; age of the last of, 145, 421.
Pythangelus, 279.
Pytharatus, when archon, 122.
Python of Astypalæa, said in the Epistles to have poisoned Phalaris's wife, ii. 79, 80, 88.

Q.

Quadrans, Roman, its value, ii. 53, 69—71; its metal, ii. 53.
Quincunx, its metal and value, ii. 53, 65.
Quinquessis, not a coin, but a sum, ii. 76.

R.

Rhegians, how long under the tyranny of Anaxilas, 223; with the Zanclæans drive his sons out of Messana, 222, 223; their government and laws, 407; reduce the weight of their brass litræ, ii. 57.
Rhegian talent, ii. 54.
Romans, the, recoin and enhance the value of their brass money, ii. 41; the metal and value of their coins, ii. 53; had no such sum as talent, ii. 55; took their names and species of money from the Dorians of Sicily and Italy, ii. 73.
Roman language, its changes, and their cause, ii. 10.
Rubenius, Albertus, his MS. treatise on Th. Mallius, 27—40.

S.

Salmasius, character of, defended, 65; his false corrections of Epicharmus, ii. 62, 63; mistakes of, ii. 70, 71.
Sannyrion the comic poet, 343, 344, 345; date of his play called Danaë, 261.
Sappho the poetess, a native of Lesbos, 374.

terfeit speeches, &c. 83; affect Attic solecisms, 355, 362.
Σοφίζειν, to make wise, when first used in this sense, ii. 29.
Sophocles quoted, 130, 194, 195, 270; corrected, 199, 200; age of, 399; his victory over Æschylus, 331; added a third actor, 300; aspired after the sublime character, 343; period between his first and last plays, 306.
Σοφόκλειος, its formation, 172.
Sophron, language of, 355; quoted, ii. 60.
Spanhemius, Ezekiel, his character of Dr. Bentley, 50, 51.
Spartans buy gold of Crœsus to gild the face of Apollo's statue, ii. 121.
Σφαγαῖσιν, obsolete form for σφαγαῖς, ii. 6.
Stanley, Mr., his correction of an epigram of Dioscorides, 282.
Στάσιμον, its change of signification, ii. 6.
Στατὴρ, not a Sicilian word, ii. 63.
Stephanus Byzantinus quoted, 411; corrected, 413.
Stephanus, Henr., his testimony of L. Castelvetro, 66.
Stesichorus, a melic or lyric poet, ii. 81; his age, 98, 106—113, 164; his language, 355; his fable of the horse and stag, 106; ii. 92; places of his birth and death, ii. 78; got his livelihood by the Muses, ii. 81; his motive for going to Greece, ii. 92; story of his poem on the wife of Nicocles, ii. 80, 81; of the contest for his ashes, ii. 78, 79, 84—86; his statue extant at Himera in the time of Cicero, ii. 79; his friendship with Phalaris a fiction, ii. 82, 83, 96—100.
Stesimbrotus defended, 322.
Stipendiarii, import of, in Pliny, 223.
Stobæus deceived by the spurious Phalaris, 89, 91; quoted, 391, 392, 398, 416, 417, 422; corrected, 372, 393, 406, 417; Zaleucus's proëmium there a forgery, 391—398; Charondas's proëmium there a forgery, 398—417.
Στοιχεῖον, element, first used by Plato in this sense, ii. 115, 116.
Strabo quoted, 358, 374, 384, 414.
Stratonicus the musician, story of, 254.
Style, arguments drawn from, their force, 91.
Suidas quoted, 38, 98, 102, 105, 182, 411; ii. 68; corrected, 244, 274, 288, 353, 374, 412; ii. 54, 59; censured, 286, 308—313, 413; age of, 93, 94; deceived by the spurious Phalaris, 89.
Sun, the, fabulous tradition respecting his cup, 174.
Superbus, age of, 134.
Susarion, his pretensions to the invention of comedy, 249, 251—261; his plays only extemporal farces, not written, 251, 253; did not bring comedy into Athens, 257; did not erect a stage there, *ibid.*; why called an Icarian, *ibid.*; the prize he contended for, 259, 260, 353; his age, 260, 261, 341; a distinct poet from Sannyrion, 260, 261; in his epoch the first rise of comedy, 349; five supposed iambics of his quoted and corrected, 253, 254; these not part of a play, 255, 256.
Sybaris, war of, with Crotona, 138; when destroyed, *ibid.*
Sybarites afterwards called Thurians, 405, 409, 410; laws used by them, 405.
Symmachus, victor at Olympia, 220; age of, 221.
Synalœpha, examples of neglect of, 203.
Syracuse, language of, 356.
Syracusan talent, ii. 54.
Syriac language, its long duration unchanged, ii. 12; cause thereof, *ibid.*; said to be yet spoken, *ibid.*

T.

Τὰ ἐξ ἁμαξῶν, origin of this proverb, 335.
Tabellæ, ii. 127.
Tabulæ triumphales quoted, 278.
Τάλαντον, ii. 53—57.
Τάλας, quantity of last syllable of, 195.
Talent, what originally meant by the word, ii. 56; talent of silver and talent of brass of the same value, ii. 49; great, what meant thereby, ii. 55; Sicilian, ii. 53—57; not a coin, but a sum, ii. 49, 75; its division, ii. 39; its value, ii. 32, 35, 36, 40, 48, 53; its metal, ii. 53; two sorts thereof, ii. 36, 40; Attic, its value, ii. 34; its division, ii. 38, 39; Attic, Sicilian, which meant in the Epistles, ii. 33, 34, 51; Neapolitan, Syracusan, Rhegian, values of, ii. 54; the Neapolitan the same with

the *old*, and the Syracusan the same with the *later* Sicilian talent, *ibid.*
Ταραντίνιον, Ταραντῖνον, Ταραντινίδιον, 391.
Tarentines, their cloths, 390, 391.
Τὰς Φρυγῶν ἑκτομὰς explained, 95.
Tatian quoted, 123; ii. 125.
Tauromenites, called Naxians in the days of Phalaris, 232; medals of, 239.
Taurominium, a city of Sicily, 232—242; formerly called Naxos, 232, 239; when and by whom built, 78, 233, 235, 236, 239; origin of the name, 233; its situation, *ibid.*; mentioned in Phalaris's Epistles many generations before it was heard of, 235.
Taurominium, Tauromenium, how written, 57, 58.
Taurominius, the river Onabala, when first so called, 238.
Ταῦρος, a bull, prize of the dithyramb, 347—349.
Taurus the Platonic philosopher, a saying which he used to repeat, ii. 117.
Τάξις, 391, 392.
Τελεβώδη, a false reading, 150.
Telemachus deposed Phalaris, 103, 105, 113, 114, 317; his descendants, 103, 104, 318.
Temple, Sir Wm., his opinion of the Epistles of Phalaris, 22, 77; his use of Delphos for Delphi, 58.
Terence quoted, 47, 55, 61, 246; ii. 19.
Terillus tyrant of Himera, 212.
Teruncius, its metal and value, ii. 53.
Testament, New, Greek of, quoted, ii. 18, 29.
Τετράεντα, mistake for Τράεντα, 138.
Tetrans, ii. 70, 72, 73.
Τετρᾶς, ii. 66, 67; whose money, ii. 50; its value, ii. 53, 69—71, 73; its metal, ii. 53.
Thales the Milesian, age of, 125; preceptor to Pythagoras, 124; nothing written by him, 392; a friend of Periander, ii. 83.
Thales the Cretan, age of, 381, 413.
Theætetus, epigram of, quoted, 120.
Theagenides, when archon, 109.
Themis, or Theomis, mistake for Thespis, 323.
Themistius quoted, ii. 119.
Themistocles at the charge of a tragedy by Phrynichus, 305; acquainted with Anaxagoras and Melissus, 323.
Theocritus quoted, 195; ii. 42, 43, 44, 95; explained, ii. 45; corrected, ii. 45; language of, 355; an epic poet, 418; his Pharmaceutria, 420.
Theodemus, or Eudemus, when archon, 382.
Theodoret, his mistake respecting the Locrians, 382.
Theopompus, when archon, 400.
Theophrastus explained, 170, 406; corrected, 406.
Θερας for θεραπαίνας, no abbreviation of the kind in Greek MSS., ii. 20.
Θῆρες, import of, 171.
Thericlean cups, 169—189, 288; whose invention, 169; named from the inventor, 169, 172; cups afterwards so called from their shape, 170; size of, 184; when in great use at Athens, 185.
Θηρίκλειος, the word, derivation of, 171, 172, 173, 181.
Thericles, inventor of the Thericlean cups, 169; a Corinthian potter, 169, 170; age of, 170, 177—186; not the same with the Athenian archon of that name, 185, 186.
Theron tyrant of Agrigentum, age of, 105, 112; ii. 126; genealogy of, 103, 104, 318; his victory at Olympia, 105.
Thersias, or Thersander, the first victor at Olympia with the ἀπήνη, 214.
Theseus, his tomb at Athens, 327—331; when built, 331; tragedies not acted at, 328—331.
Thespis, the inventor of tragedy, 250, 251, 275, 281—296; age of, 251, 296—324, 393; an Icarian, 257; carried his plays about the villages in carts, 258, 336; called ὀρχηστικὸς, 284, 312—317; his plays all satyrical, 294, 295; styled κῶμοι, 353; never had women for their subject, 291; plays forged in his name by Heraclides, 289—295; the alphabet not completed till after his time, 291, 292; his acting hindered by Solon, 318; date of his first play, 296, 297, 303, 304, 321; supposed fragments of his quoted, 291, 294; another fragment, corrected, 295.
Θς for θεὸς, ii. 20.
Thucydides quoted, 205, 388; not understood by the vulgar in the time of Oppian, ii. 13.
Θυγάτηρ, import of, in New Attic, ii. 2, 17—20.

Thurians, when and by whom colonised, 385, 398, 405, 409, 410; when subverted, 385; money of, like the Attic, 410; their language, *ibid.*; their misgovernment, 385; their lawgiver and laws, 398—417.
Thurii, when built, 385.
Timæus, Sicilian historian, age in which he wrote, ii. 104, 108; denies the story of Phalaris's Bull, ii. 104, 105, 108.
Timon, a writer of silli, 334.
Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους of the sophists, 83.
Tragedy, age of, 274—354; by whom invented, 251, 275, 281—296; not older than Thespis, 324—354; what it arose out of, 260, 325, 332, 340; its first form, 250, 284, 288, 321, 325, 333; its first prize, 260, 275, 296, 301, 338, 340, 347, 349, 353, 354; its first subject, 293, 294; its first measures, 249, 250; by whom improved, 282, 321; expense and furniture of, 399—401; in its infancy had nothing pompous or ornamental, 393.
Tragic chorus: see chorus.
Τράγος, a goat, the first prize of tragedy, 260, 275, 296, 301, 338, 340, 347, 349, 353, 354; not continued to the time of Phrynichus, 301.
Τραγῳδία, the word not older than tragedy itself, or Thespis, 274, 275, 337, 338, 340, 393; its derivation, 275, 338, 340, 354; never means comedy, 342, 350, 352; a metaphorical signification of, 393, 394, 398; this when first used, 398, 399, 401.
Tressis, not a coin, but a sum, ii. 76.
Triens, Roman, value of, ii. 53, 69, 70; metal of, ii. 53.
Τριᾶς, ii. 66, 67, 73; whose money, ii. 50; its value, ii. 53, 69, 70; its metal, ii. 53.
Τρία τάλαντα, false reading for τριᾶντα, ii. 38.
Τριξοὶ for τρισσοί, ii. 72.
Trochaic foot, proper for dancing, 250.
Τριγῳδία, the same as κωμῳδία, 350, 353; never means tragedy, 342, 350, 25[illegible] [illegible] 252—
Tynnondas tyrant of Eubœa, age of, 103.
Tyrants, thirty, date of their usurpation and expulsion, ii. 4.
Tzetzes, Joh., quoted and explained, 96, 97; corrected, 347; deceived by the spurious Phalaris, 89.

U.

Uncia, its metal and value, ii. 53.

V.

Valerius Maximus, mistake of, 241.
Valesius, Hen., his false emendation of Dionysius Hal., 126.
Velia, an Ionic colony of the Phocæans, 375, 376.
Vibius Sequester corrected, 238.
Virgil quoted, 157, 171, 193, 227, 268, 326; ii. 17; explained, 335; examples from, of prolepsis, 234; of neglect of synalœpha, 203.
Vitruvius quoted, 393; explained, ii. 72, 73.
Vizzanius, his edition of Ocellus Lucanus, 423—428; preface of, quoted, 424; his interpretation of a passage of Jamblichus, 424, 425.
Vossius, Ger., mistakes of, 286—288, 327.

W.

We, the frequent use of, for I, 25, 46.
Wolfius, a mistake of, 94.
Wotton, Mr., his testimony that the Dissertation was written at his request, 6; his censure of Sir Wm. Temple defended, 58; address to, why omitted in second edition, 79.

X.

Xenocles the tragic poet, authors who mention him, 279, 280; his victory over Euripides accounted for, 279; plays of, 279, 280.
Xenocrates, when victor at the Pythian games, 105, 112.
Xenophanes, a writer of silli, 334; an epic poet, 418.
Xenophilus, age of, 145; the last Pythagorean, 146, 421.
Xerxes, his expedition, date of, 305; ii. 125; said to have eaten his mother Atossa, ii. 125.

Z.

Ζαγρεαῖος, a barbarism for Ζαγρεύς, 9[illegible]
Zaleucus the Locrian lawgiver, his [illegible]tence doubted, 376, 377; a[illegible] 380, 381; no Pythagorean, 37[illegible]

INDEX

TO THE

DISSERTATIONS ON THE EPISTLES

OF

THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES, AND ON THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

A.

ÆLIAN, his self-contradiction, ii. 185, 186.

Æschines entertained at the court of Dionysius, ii. 204, 205.

Æsop, whether he left any written fables behind him, ii. 223; no Greek actor of that name in the time of Aristophanes, ii. 224; whose slave, ii. 233, 234; his conversation with Crœsus, ii. 233; place of his death, *ibid.*; his deformity a fiction, ii. 234—237; the story first broached by Planudes, ii. 234; and never hinted at by any author before that time, ii. 234, 235; a statue erected by the Athenians to his memory, ii. 235; epigram thereon, ii. 236; ambassador of Crœsus to Corinth and Delphi, *ibid.*; his rebuke of Solon, *ibid.*; his fellow-slave, ii. 237; Fables of: see Æsopean Fables; Life of, the gross ignorance it betrays, ii. 233—237; its author, ii. 233—236.

Æsop the Roman actor, ii. 224.

Æsopean Fables, by whom versified and collected, ii. 225—227; fable referred to by Aristophanes not in the present collection, ii. 224, 225; a fable by Socrates, quotation from, ii. 225; those collected by Demetrius Phalereus not the same as the present, ii. 225; edition in elegiac verse, cited by Suidas under the name of Μῦθοι, or Μυθικά, quotations from it, ii. 225, 226; edition by Babrius in choliambics, ii. 226, 227; quotations from it, ii. 227, 229—231; compendium of, by one Gabrias in iambics, 226, 227; Latin versions, ii. 227; the Greek fables now extant, two parcels of, ii. 227; the more ancient one, when and by whom first published, *ibid.*; number of fables it contains, *ibid.*; falsely ascribed to Æsop, ii. 227, 228; is nothing else but a prose epitome of Babrius, ii. 229; quotations from it, ii. 229—232; the later parcel, by whom probably written, ii. 232, 233; several passages in, betraying a modern writer, ii. 232; first appeared with Æsop's life, ii. 233; quotations from it, ii. 232, 233.

Æthiopia, king of, his problem to Amasis, ii. 234.

Agathias the poet quoted, ii. 236.

Agatho the tragic poet, a friend of Euripides, ii. 208, 215; no comic poet of that name, ii. 208, 209; lashed by the ancients for his effeminacy, ii. 209; Plato's *convivium* held in his house, *ibid.*

Αἰσώπου γελοῖον, what meant thereby, ii. 224.

Alexander, his remark on Xenocrates's refusal to accept a present from him, ii. 215; his munificence to the same, ii. 220.

Allatius, Leo, first published the Epistles of Socrates, &c. ii. 189; was fully persuaded of their genuineness, *ibid.*; his inference from a passage of Libanius disputed, ii. 191; gross blunder of, ii. 196, 197.

Ammonius quoted, ii. 221.

Anacharsis, spurious epistles of, ii. 222.
Ἀνεθεὶς, its meaning explained, ii. 218.
Anytus, prosecutor of Socrates, banished, ii. 197.
Aphthonius the rhetorician, his essay upon some Æsopic fables, ii. 232.
Apollonides, Nicenus, his treatise Περὶ κατεψευσμένης Ἱστορίας, ii. 206, 221; pronounces the Epistles of Euripides and of Aratus to have been forged by Sabirius Pollo, ii. 206; a book of his dedicated to Tiberius, ii. 221.
Aratus, epistles of, according to Apollonides, spurious, ii. 206.
Archelaus king of Macedonia, his invitation to Socrates, ii. 189, 190; entertains Euripides and Agatho at his court, ii. 208.
Arete daughter of Aristippus, ii. 199.
Aristippus, his dialogues, in what idiom written, ii. 199; entertained at the court of Dionysius, ii. 204.
Aristophanes quoted, ii. 223, 224; explained, ii. 224; Scholiast on, mistaken, ii. 209, 224.
Aristotle, his Περὶ Εὐγενείας suspected by Plutarch to be spurious, ii. 201; attended by a company of scholars, ii. 234.
Arundel Marble, its authority questioned, ii. 186.
Athenæus quoted, ii. 205, 232; corrected, ii. 232.
Athenians, the, banish those concerned in the accusation of Socrates, ii. 195; put Melitus, his prosecutor, to death, ii. 197; erect a statue to the memory of Æsop, ii. 235.
Avienus, his Latin Æsopean fables in elegiac verse, ii. 227; preface to, quoted, ii. 224.

B.

Babrius turned the Æsopean fables into choliambics, ii. 226; by what authors mentioned, *ibid.*; age to which he belonged, ii. 228; quoted, ii. 227, 229—233; corrected, ii. 231.
Bachet, Monsieur, his Life of Æsop, ii. 222.
Βαλακρὸς, Macedonian idiom for φαλακρὸς, ii. 200.
Barnes, Joshua, the epistles of Euripides held by him to be genuine, ii. 206; his arguments answered, ii. 207, 211, &c.
Βερενίκη, Macedonian idiom for Φερενίκη, ii. 200.
Βερνίκη, a mistake for Βερενίκη, ii. 200.
Βίλιππος, Macedonian idiom for Φίλιππος, ii. 200.
Βοῶν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, a Hebraism, ii. 232.
Βούνευρον, a beast, the word unknown to ancient authors, ii. 232.
Βούταλις, a bird, the word unknown to ancient authors, ii. 232.

C.

Cephisophon, his friendship with Euripides, ii. 213; the circumstance which broke it off, *ibid.*; this mentioned by all authors who speak of him, ii. 214.
Clito the herb-woman, mother of Euripides, ii. 219.
Conon, the walls of Athens when repaired by him, ii. 193, 196.
Crates, spurious letters of, ii. 222.
Cyrus, his expedition, date of, 197.

D.

Demetrius Phalereus, his collections of Æsopean fables, ii. 225; probably the first of their kind committed to writing in the form of a book, *ibid.*; seem to have been in prose, *ibid.*; not the same with those now extant, *ibid.*
Democritus, spurious letters of, ii. 222.
Diodorus Siculus, of high credit in a point of chronology, ii. 188.
Diogenes, spurious letters of, ii. 222.
Diogenes Laërtius quoted, ii. 192, 193, 195, 199, 225.
Dion Chrysostom quoted, ii. 224.
Dionysius the younger, when he came to the crown, ii. 203.

E.

Εἰδεχθὴς Κορυδεὺς, a proverb, ii. 236.
Ἐφεστιάδων, a mistake for Ἡφαιστιαδῶν, ii. 199.
Erasmus mistaken, ii. 223.
Eubulides, when magistrate, ii. 196.
Euripides, his Palamedes quoted, ii. 196; this play when acted, *ibid.*; resides with Archelaus, ii. 208; a friend and acquaintance of Agatho, *ibid.*; not likely to be concerned at the loss of Sophocles's plays, ii. 217; one cause of his leaving Athens, ii. 213; his age when Archelaus came to the crown, ii. 219; worried by a pack of dogs, ii. 217; date of

his death, ii. 196; his sons alive in the year of his death, ii. 220.
Euripides, epistles of, spurious, ii. 206—221; by whom espoused as genuine, ii. 206; according to Apollonides, forged by Sabirius Pollo, *ibid.*; their number, *ibid.*; every one of them contains matter enough for a detection of its spuriousness, ii. 208; at variance with known facts, ii. 208, 209, 212—214, 219; their extravagance and air of sophistry, ii. 214—221; quoted and explained, ii. 218.
Eusebius, his judgment questioned, ii. 204.

G.

Gabrias, his compendium of the Æsopean fables in iambics, ii. 226, 227.
Gelo, his victory over the Carthaginians, date of, ii. 186.
Gregorius Gyraldus mistaken, ii. 209.
Gryllus, son of Xenophon, elegies written on him, ii. 195.

H.

Heraclitus, spurious letters of, ii. 222.
Hermippus quoted, ii. 192; mistaken about Polycrates's oration against Socrates, ii. 192, 195; another mistake of, ii. 195.
Hesychius quoted, ii. 199, 224; mistaken, ii. 199.
Hiero of Syracuse, when he began to reign, ii. 185, 186; his race-horses and tent at the Olympian games, *ibid.*; when victorious at the Pythian games, ii. 185.
Hieronymus, Rhodius, produces a temporary Athenian statute allowing polygamy, ii. 200; this suspected to be a forgery, ii. 201, 202.
Hippocrates, spurious letters of, ii. 222.
Horace quoted, ii. 224.

J.

Job, passage borrowed from, ii. 227.
Ἰφίστιος, Ἰφιστιάδαι, mistakes in Hesychius for Ἡφαίστιος, &c. ii. 199.
Isocrates quoted, ii. 194; his censure of Polycrates, *ibid.*

K.

Κεβλῆ, Macedonian idiom for κεφαλῆ, ii. 200.
Κηφεὺς, false reading for Νικαεὺς, ii. 221.

L.

Laches, magistrate when Socrates was put to death, ii. 195.
Leon the Salaminian, ii. 191.
Libanius quoted and explained, ii. 190, 191; an evidence against the genuineness of Socrates's epistles, ii. 191; his defence of Socrates a scholastic exercise, ii. 194.

M.

Martial quoted, ii. 207.
Melitus, prosecutor of Socrates, put to death by the Athenians, ii. 197.
Mesatus, mentioned in Euripides's epistles, no such person, ii. 208, 209.
Momus, his carping at the works of the gods, ii. 228; the fable differently told by authors, *ibid.*
Μῦθοι, Μυθικὰ, ii. 225.
Myrto, pretended wife of Socrates, ii. 200—203; never spoken of by any of Socrates's acquaintance, ii. 201.

N.

Neveletus, more ancient parcel of the present Æsopean fables first published by him, ii. 227; thinks them spurious, *ibid.*

P.

Panætius the Stoic confutes the tradition of Socrates's two wives, ii. 201.
Pausanias, three of Themistocles's letters on the subject of his story, ii. 186; date of his death, ii. 187.
Pearson, Bishop, holds the epistles of Socrates to be spurious, ii. 205.
Φ changed into B in the Macedonian idiom, ii. 200.
Phædrus, who gives the title to the dialogue of Plato, ii. 192; dead before the days of Socrates, *ibid.*
Phædrus the poet, his Latin version of the Æsopean fables, ii. 227; quoted, ii. 235.
Phalaris, epistles of, by whom considered genuine, ii. 190.
Phavorinus quoted and explained, ii. 193; detects the common mistake about Polycrates's oration against Socrates, ii. 193, 195, 196.
Φιλόσοφος, the word not heard of in the time of Æsop, ii. 233; by whom invented, ii. 234.
Philostratus is silent as to Æsop's deformity, ii. 235.

Φροῖδος explained, ii. 218.
Planudes, Maximus, the present fables of Æsop ascribed to him by Vavasor, ii. 222; his translations into Greek, ii. 232; the later portion of the present fables probably written by him, ii. 232, 233; author of the Life of Æsop, ii. 233; his age, ii. 234; makes Æsop a monster of ugliness, ii. 234, 235.
Plato, his story of Socrates at the battle of Delium, ii. 190; the story, in the opinion of Athenæus, a fiction, ii. 192; wrote a defence of Socrates as a scholastic exercise, ii. 194; epistle of, to Dionysius quoted, ii. 203; its date, *ibid.*; entertained at Dionysius's court, ii. 204, 205; attended by a company of scholars, ii. 234; makes no allusion to the deformity of Æsop, ii. 235.
Plutarch is silent as to the deformity of Æsop, ii. 235.
Polycrates did not draw up the charge against Socrates, ii. 192—197; such a report not mentioned till some years after Socrates's condemnation, ii. 193; his accusation of Socrates not a real charge at the trial, but written afterwards as a scholastic exercise, ii. 193, 194; so his apologies of Busiris and Clytæmnestra, *ibid.*
Polygamy against the law of Athens, ii. 200; its impolicy, ii. 201, 202.
Pythagoras first invented the word φιλόσοφος, ii. 233.

Q.

Quintilian mistaken respecting Polycrates's accusation of Socrates, ii. 195.

R.

Rhodopis the fellow-slave of Æsop, proverb in memory of her beauty, ii. 237.

S.

Sabirius Pollo said to have forged the epistles of Euripides and Aratus, ii. 206.
Σαβίριος Πόλλων, probably a mistaken reading for Σαβίδιος Πολλίων, ii. 221.
Scaliger, J. mistaken, ii. 223.
Σχολαστικοὶ, scholars, the word not used in this sense in the time of Aristotle, ii. 234.
Socrates denied his company to Archelaus, ii. 189; dead before Polycrates's oration was made, ii. 194; his trial, date of, ii. 203; his death, date of, ii. 195—197; his scholars retired to Megara after his death, ii. 198; story of his having two wives at one time examined and refuted, ii. 200—203; his custom with respect to presents sent him, ii. 214; the first who put the Æsopic fables into verse, ii. 225; fable quoted, *ibid.*; his face a subject of raillery, ii. 235.
Socrates and his scholars, epistles of, spurious, ii. 189—205; when first printed, ii. 189; defended as genuine by their editor, *ibid.*; unknown to Athenæus, ii. 190; silence of the ancients respecting them, *ibid.*; their extravagance, ii. 189, 190; at variance with known facts, ii. 197, 198; and with the best authorities, ii. 201—205; inconsistent with the character of their supposed writers, ii. 191; their violations of chronology, ii. 192—197, 200, 203.
Sophists accustomed to make a show of their art on difficult subjects and paradoxes, ii. 193; their propensity to the extravagant, ii. 184, 190; those who practised forgeries generally men of small endowments, ii. 214.
Sophocles, one of the Athenian generals in the Samian war, ii. 216.
Suidas quoted, ii. 182, 208, 225—227, 229, 230; mistaken, ii. 209; the only old writer who mentions Themistocles's epistles, ii. 182.

T.

Temple, Sir William, his commendation of the Æsopean fables a paradox, ii. 222.
Themistius mistaken respecting Polycrates's accusation of Socrates, ii. 195.
Themistocles, his flight into Asia, in whose reign, ii. 182, 183, 188; number of the cities given to him there, ii. 183; his reception at Argos, ii. 184; advised the Greeks to plunder Hiero's tent at Olympia, ii. 185, 186; date of his banishment, ii. 186, 187; accused of conspiring with Pausanias, ii. 187, 188; amount

of his fortune before he meddled with public affairs, ii. 220.
Themistocles, epistles of, spurious, ii. 182—188; when first printed, ii. 182; believed by their editor to be genuine, *ibid.*; suspected by some, *ibid.*; Suidas the only old writer who mentions them, *ibid.*; if known to ancient authors, would have prevented their disputes about the time of his flight, &c., ii. 153; why they all bear date after his banishment, *ibid.*; the subject of many of them worthless, ii. 184; their extravagance, *ibid.*; their violations of chronology, ii. 185—188.
Theodoret, his judgment questioned, ii. 204.
Theophrastus quoted, ii. 185; his authority much superior to that of Ælian, *ibid.*
Θεοφράστειον βλέμμα, a proverb, ii. 236.
Titianus, Julius, his Latin Æsopean fables in iambics, ii. 227.

V.

Vavasor ascribes the present Æsopean fables to Planudes, ii. 222.

X.

Xanthippe, wife of Socrates, ii. 200—203.
Xanthus master of Æsop, ii. 233.
Xenocrates the philosopher, ii. 214, 215, 220.
Xenophon, his defence of Socrates a scholastic exercise, ii. 194; his march, date of, ii. 197; his memoirs of Socrates, motive for introducing Aristippus in them, ii. 198; his splendour and hospitality at Scillus, *ibid.*; the only author who represents Xanthippe as a scold, ii. 203; his character of her suspected by Athenæus, *ibid.*; letters of, cited in Stobæus, Theodoret, and Eusebius, not found in Allatius's collection, ii. 204; visits the court of Dionysius, ii. 205.

A TABLE

SHEWING THE PAGES IN THE EARLIER EDITIONS OF

THE DISSERTATIONS AND EPISTOLA AD MILLIUM,

WHICH CORRESPOND RESPECTIVELY

WITH THE PAGES IN THE PRESENT TWO VOLUMES.

DISSERTATION UPON THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS.

1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.
Vol. I.			Vol. I.			Vol. I.		
i	iii	i	xxxviii	lx	xxx	76	2	1
ii	iv	i	xxxix	lxi	xxxi	77	3	2
iii	v	ii	xl	lxiii	xxxii	78	4	3
iv	vii	iii	xli	lxiv	xxxiii	79	5	3
v	ix	iv	xlii	lxvi	xxxiv	80	6	4
vi	x	v	xliii	lxvii	xxxiv	81	7	5
vii	xii	v	xliv	lxix	xxxv	82	8	6
viii	xiv	vi	xlv	lxxi	xxxvi	83	10	7
ix	xv	vii	xlvi	lxxii	xxxvii	84	11	8
x	xvii	vii	xlvii	lxxiv	xxxvii	85	12	8
xi	xviii	ix	xlviii	lxxv	xxxviii	86	13	9
xii	xx	x	xlix	lxxvii	xxxix	87	14	10
xiii	xxii	x	l	lxxviii	xl	88	16	11
xiv	xxiii	xi	li	lxxx	xli	89	17	12
xv	xxv	xii	lii	lxxxi	xli	90	18	13
xvi	xxvi	xiii	liii	lxxxiii	xlii	91	19	14
xvii	xxviii	xiv	liv	lxxxiv	xliii	92	20	15
xviii	xxix	xiv	lv	lxxxvi	xliv	93	21	15
xix	xxx	xv	lvi	lxxxvii	xliv	94	23	16
xx	xxxii	xvi	lvii	lxxxviii	xlv	95	24	17
xxi	xxxiii	xvii	lviii	xc	xlvi	96	25	18
xxii	xxxv	xviii	lix	xci	xlvii	97	26	19
xxiii	xxxvi	xviii	lx	xciii	xlvii	98	27	20
xxiv	xxxviii	xix	lxi	xciv	xlviii	99	29	20
xxv	xl	xx	lxii	xcv	xlix	100	30	21
xxvi	xli	xxi	lxiii	xcvii	l	101	31	22
xxvii	xliii	xxii	lxiv	xcix	li	102	32	23
xxviii	xlv	xxiii	lxv	c	li	103	33	24
xxix	xlvi	xxiii	lxvi	ci	lii	104	35	25
xxx	xlviii	xxiv	lxvii	ciii	liii	105	36	25
xxxi	xlix	xxv	lxviii	civ	liv	106	37	26
xxxii	li	xxvi	lxix	cvi	lv	107	38	27
xxxiii	lii	xxvii	lxx	cvii	lv	108	39	28
xxxiv	liv	xxvii	lxxi	cix	lvi	109	40	28
xxxv	lvi	xxviii	lxxii	cx	lvii	110	41	29
xxxvi	lvii	xxix	lxxiii	cxi	lviii	111	42	30
xxxvii	lviii	xxx	75	1	1	112	43	31

1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.
Vol. I.			Vol. I.			Vol. I.		
113	44	32	170	109	78	227	171	123
114	45	32	171	110	79	228	173	123
115	47	33	172	112	80	229	174	124
116	48	34	173	113	81	230	175	125
117	49	35	174	114	81	231	176	126
118	50	36	175	115	82	232	177	127
119	51	37	176	116	83	233	179	128
120	52	38	177	117	84	234	180	128
121	53	38	178	118	84	235	181	129
122	54	39	179	119	85	236	182	130
123	55	40	180	120	86	237	183	131
124	56	41	181	122	87	238	184	132
125	58	41	182	123	88	239	186	132
126	58	42	183	124	89	240	187	133
127	60	43	184	125	89	241	188	134
128	61	44	185	126	90	242	189	135
129	62	45	186	127	91	243	190	136
130	63	46	187	128	92	244	191	137
131	64	46	188	129	92	245	192	137
132	65	47	189	130	93	246	194	138
133	66	48	190	132	94	247	195	139
134	67	49	191	133	95	248	196	140
135	69	50	192	134	96	249	197	140
136	70	50	193	135	96	250	198	145
137	71	51	194	135	97	251	199	142
138	72	52	195	136	97	252	200	143
139	73	53	196	137	98	253	201	144
140	74	54	197	138	99	254	202	144
141	76	54	198	139	100	255	203	145
142	77	55	199	140	100	256	205	146
143	78	56	200	141	101	257	206	147
144	79	57	201	142	102	258	207	148
145	80	58	202	143	102	259	208	148
146	81	59	203	144	103	260	209	149
147	82	59	204	145	104	261	210	150
148	84	60	205	146	104	262	211	151
149	85	61	206	147	105	263	212	152
150	86	62	207	148	106	264	213	152
151	86	63	208	150	107	265	215	153
152	88	63	209	151	108	266	215	154
153	89	64	210	152	109	267	217	155
154	90	65	211	153	109	268	218	155
155	91	66	212	154	110	269	219	156
156	92	67	213	155	111	270	219	157
157	93	68	214	156	112	271	220	157
158	95	68	215	157	113	272	222	158
159	96	69	216	158	113	273	223	159
160	97	70	217	160	114	274	224	160
161	98	71	218	161	115	275	225	160
162	99	72	219	162	116	276	226	161
163	101	72	220	163	117	277	227	162
164	102	73	221	164	118	278	227	162
165	103	74	222	165	118	279	228	163
166	104	75	223	167	119	280	229	164
167	105	76	224	168	120	281	230	164
168	107	76	225	169	121	282	232	165
169	108	77	226	170	122	283	232	166

1886.	1699.	1777.	1886.	1699.	1777.	1886.	1699.	1777.
Vol. I.			Vol. I.			Vol. I.		
284	233	167	341	295	213	398	357	258
285	234	167	342	296	213	399	358	259
286	235	168	343	297	214	400	359	260
287	236	169	344	298	215	401	361	260
288	237	170	345	299	216	402	362	261
289	238	170	346	300	216	403	363	262
290	239	171	347	301	217	404	364	263
291	240	172	348	302	218	405	364	264
292	241	173	349	303	218	406	366	264
293	242	174	350	304	219	407	367	265
294	243	175	351	305	220	408	368	266
295	244	175	352	306	221	409	369	267
296	245	176	353	307	222	410	370	268
297	247	177	354	308	223	411	371	269
298	248	178	355	310	223	412	372	269
299	249	179	356	311	224	413	372	269
300	250	180	357	312	225	414	373	270
301	251	180	358	313	226	415	374	271
302	252	181	359	315	227	416	375	271
303	254	182	360	316	227	417	376	272
304	255	183	361	317	228	418	377	273
305	256	184	362	318	229	419	378	274
306	257	184	363	319	230	420	379	274
307	258	185	364	320	231	421	380	275
308	259	186	365	322	231	422	382	276
309	260	187	366	323	232	423	383	277
310	262	188	367	324	233	424	384	278
311	263	189	368	325	234	425	385	279
312	264	189	369	326	235	426	386	279
313	265	190	370	327	236	427	387	280
314	266	191	371	328	236	428	389	281
315	267	192	372	330	237	429	390	282
316	268	193	373	331	238	430	391	283
317	269	193	374	332	239			
318	270	194	375	333	240			
319	271	195	376	334	240	Vol. II.		
320	272	196	377	335	241	1	392	283
321	273	197	378	337	242	2	393	284
322	274	197	379	338	243	3	394	285
323	275	198	380	339	244	4	395	285
324	277	199	381	340	245	5	396	286
325	277	200	382	341	246	6	398	287
326	278	200	383	342	247	7	399	288
327	280	201	384	343	247	8	400	289
328	281	202	385	344	248	9	401	290
329	282	203	386	345	249	10	402	290
330	283	204	387	346	250	11	403	291
331	284	204	388	347	251	12	404	292
332	285	205	389	349	251	13	406	293
333	286	206	390	350	252	14	407	294
334	287	207	391	351	253	15	408	294
335	288	208	392	352	254	16	409	295
336	289	209	393	353	255	17	410	296
337	290	209	394	354	255	18	412	297
338	292	210	395	355	256	19	413	298
339	293	211	396	356	257	20	414	298
340	294	212	397	357	258	21	415	299

1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.	1836.	1699.	1777.
Vol. II.			Vol. II.			Vol. II.		
22	416	300	58	458	330	94	498	359
23	417	301	59	459	331	95	499	360
24	419	302	60	460	331	96	500	361
25	420	302	61	461	332	97	501	361
26	421	303	62	462	333	98	502	362
27	422	304	63	462	334	99	504	363
28	423	305	64	463	334	100	505	364
29	424	306	65	464	335	101	506	365
30	425	306	66	465	336	102	507	366
31	426	307	67	466	337	103	508	366
32	428	308	68	467	337	104	510	367
33	429	309	69	469	338	105	511	368
34	430	310	70	470	339	106	512	369
35	431	311	71	471	340	107	513	370
36	432	311	72	472	341	108	514	370
37	434	312	73	473	342	109	516	371
38	435	313	74	474	342	110	517	372
39	436	314	75	476	343	111	518	373
40	437	315	76	477	344	112	519	374
41	438	316	77	478	345	113	520	375
42	440	316	78	479	346	114	522	375
43	441	317	79	481	347	115	523	377
44	442	318	80	482	348	116	524	377
45	443	319	81	483	348	117	525	378
46	444	319	82	484	349	118	527	379
47	445	320	83	485	350	119	528	380
48	446	321	84	487	351	120	529	381
49	448	322	85	488	352	121	530	381
50	449	323	86	489	352	122	531	382
51	450	324	87	490	353	123	533	383
52	451	325	88	491	354	124	534	384
53	453	326	89	493	355	125	535	385
54	454	326	90	494	356	126	536	385
55	455	327	91	495	357	127	538	386
56	456	328	92	496	357	128	539	387
57	457	329	93	497	358	129	540	388

A DISSERTATION UPON THE EPISTLES OF PHALARIS, THEMISTOCLES, SOCRATES, EURIPIDES, AND ON THE FABLES OF ÆSOP.

1836.	1697.	1777.	1836.	1697.	1777.	1836.	1697.	1777.
Vol. II.			Vol. II.			Vol. II.		
133	3		144	19		154	35	
135	5		145	21		155	36	
136	6		146	22		156	37	
137	8		147	24		157	39	
138	9		148	25		158	41	
139	11		149	27		159	42	
140	13		150	28		160	44	
141	14		151	30		161	45	
142	16		152	32		162	47	
143	18		153	33		163	48	

1836.	1697.	1777.	1836.	1697.	1777.	1836.	1697.	1777.
Vol. II.			Vol. II.			Vol. II.		
164	50		189	89	398	214	122	420
165	52		190	90	398	215	124	421
166	53		191	91	399	216	125	422
167	55		192	93	401	217	127	423
168	57		193	94	401	218	128	424
169	58		194	96	402	219	130	425
170	60		195	98	403	220	131	426
171	61		196	99	404	221	133	427
172	63		197	100	405	222	134	429
173	65		198	102	406	223	135	430
174	66		199	103	407	224	136	430
175	68		200	105	408	225	138	431
176	69		201	106	409	226	139	432
177	71		202	108	410	227	140	433
178	73		203	110	411	228	141	434
179	74		204	111	412	229	143	434
180	76		205	113	413	230	143	435
181	77		206	114	415	231	144	435
182	79	391	207	115	415	232	146	436
183	80	391	208	117	416	233	147	437
184	81	392	209	118	417	234	148	437
185	83	393	210	120	418	235	149	438
186	85	395	211	121	419	236	150	439
187	86	396	212	121	419	237	152	440
188	88	397	213	121	419			

EPISTOLA AD JOANNEM MILLIUM.

1836.	1691.	1713.	1836.	1691.	1713.	1836.	1691.	1713.
Vol. II.			Vol. II.			Vol. II.		
241	1	1	264	18	16	287	35	31
242	1	1	265	19	17	288	36	32
243	2	2	266	19	17	289	37	32
244	3	2	267	20	18	290	38	33
245	3	3	268	21	18	291	39	34
246	4	4	269	21	19	292	39	34
247	5	4	270	22	20	293	40	35
248	6	5	271	23	20	294	41	36
249	6	6	272	24	21	295	42	36
250	7	7	273	25	22	296	42	37
251	8	7	274	26	23	297	43	38
252	9	8	275	27	23	298	44	38
253	10	9	276	27	24	299	45	39
254	11	10	277	28	25	300	46	40
255	11	10	278	29	25	301	46	40
256	12	11	279	30	26	302	47	41
257	13	11	280	30	27	303	48	42
258	13	12	281	31	28	304	49	42
259	14	13	282	31	28	305	50	43
260	15	13	283	32	28	306	51	44
261	16	14	284	33	29	307	51	44
262	16	15	285	34	30	308	52	45
263	17	15	286	34	30	309	53	46

1836.	1691.	1713.	1836.	1691.	1713.	1836.	1691.	1713.
Vol. II.			Vol. II.			Vol. II.		
310	54	46	329	67	58	348	83	72
311	54	47	330	68	59	349	84	72
312	55	48	331	68	59	350	84	73
313	56	48	332	69	60	351	85	74
314	56	49	333	70	61	352	86	74
315	57	49	334	71	61	353	87	75
316	57	50	335	72	62	354	88	76
317	58	50	336	72	63	355	89	77
318	59	51	337	73	63	356	90	77
319	59	52	338	74	64	357	91	78
320	60	52	339	75	65	358	92	79
321	61	53	340	76	66	359	92	79
322	62	54	341	76	66	360	93	80
323	63	54	342	77	67	361	94	81
324	63	55	343	78	68	362	95	82
325	64	56	344	79	69	363	96	82
326	65	56	345	80	69	364	97	83
327	65	57	346	81	70	365	98	84
328	66	57	347	82	71			

END OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVEY, AND FRANKLYN,
46 St. Martin's Lane.

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 010 234 420

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(415) 723-9201
All books may be recalled after 7 days

DATE DUE

JUL 21 1999

F/S JUL 31 1996